ESSENTIAL TORAH TEMMAH

VAYIKRA

THE ESSENTIAL

TORAH TEMIMAH

In his introduction to the *Torah Temimah*, Harav Boruch Halevi Epstein writes:

"It has been our aim to show that this Torah, the Written Law, is a twin sister, as it were, to the Oral Law. They are inseparable — as body and soul, as flame and wick — the one, intimately enmeshed with the other. And so long as the Written Law is not conjoined with the explanations and addenda of the Oral Law, it is not a complete Torah. Its message is not complete and its mitzvah is not complete."

That signal work — a telescoped synthesis of the Written and Oral Law — has become one of the most popular classics of Torah literature. Now, with the appearance of *The Essential Torah Temimah*, this vital resource has been rendered accessible to the English-reading public.

More than a verbatim translation, *The Essential Torah Temimah* is a thorough elucidation of the original text, using langauge that is fluent, literate and articulate. Biblical verses are translated in accordance with the Talmudic derivations, and the Talmudic sources are translated so as to reveal the derivations as implicit in the verse. Within the translation, Rabbi Silverstein incorporates the author's commentary and others', to provide maximum clarity.

This scholarly, erudite volume demonstrates Rabbi Silverstein's thorough mastery of his subject and his unique ability to transmit complex material in lucid, readily comprehensible fashion.

Jacket: Harvey Klineman

About the Translator

Rabbi Silverstein, an alumnus of the Mesivta Rabbi Chaim Berlin, was Phi Beta Kappa at Brooklyn College, from which he graduated at the head of his class, summa cum laude, with honors in English. In addition to his work as author and as translator of Torah classics (he is nearing completion of the monumental Complete Ein Yaakov) Rabbi Silverstein has taught at leading universities in the United States and in Israel. He has served as Principal of the Rambam Torah Institute in Los Angeles, the Magen David Yeshiva in Brooklyn, the Tonya Soloveitchik-Yeshiva University High School for Girls in Manhattan, and the Torah Academy of Philadelphia. He has taught on all levels, lectured extensively on teaching methodology, and supervised teachers for the Israeli Ministry of Education. He resides with his family in Jerusalem.

Also translated by Rabbi Shraga Silverstein
The Path of the Just
The Gates of Repentance
The Knowing Heart

FELDHEIM PUBLISHERS, Ltd. POB 6525 Jerusalem, Israel

PHILIPP FELDHEIM, Inc. 200 Airport Executive Park Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977

A complimentary copy of the new catalog of Feldheim Books is available on request.

Printed in Israel



ISBN 0 87306 504 2

TORAH TEMIMAH

תורת ה' תמימה משיבת גפש

The Torah of Hashem is complete — it restores the soul.

תהילים יט:ח PSALMS 19:8 תהילים



THE ESSENTIAL TORAH TEMINAH

by Harav Boruch Halevi Epstein

Translated and elucidated by SHRAGA SILVERSTEIN

VAYIKRA



FELDHEIM PUBLISHERS

Jerusalem / New York

First published 1989 • ISBN 0-87306-504-2

Copyright © by Shraga Silverstein

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Philipp Feldheim Inc.
200 Airport Executive Park
Spring Valley, NY 10977
Feldheim Publishers Ltd.
POB 6525
Jerusalem, Israel

Printed in Israel

Vayikra

1:1 And He called to Moses, and the L-rd spoke to him from the tent of meeting to say:

And He called to Moses, and the L-rd spoke to him - It was taught: Why "called" before "spoke"? The Torah hereby teaches us *derech eretz* [proper conduct] — that one should not tell anything to his neighbor without calling him [to gain his attention] first (Yoma 4b).

to say - R. Menassiah Rabbah said: Whence is it derived that if one tells something to his neighbor the other may not repeat it unless expressly permitted to do so? From "and the L-rd spoke to him from the tent of meeting to say" [implying "permitting him to say to Israel"] (*Ibid.*).²

Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: A man, if he offer from you an offering to the L-rd, from the beasts

 from the cattle and from the sheep — shall you offer your offerings.

Speak to the children of Israel - followed by (*Ibid.* 4): "And he shall place his hand ..." — the sons of Israel place the hand, but the daughters of Israel do not (Kiddushin 36a)."

Speak to the children of Israel - followed by (*Ibid.* 4): "And he shall place his hand ..." — the children of *Israel* place the hand, but gentiles, [from whom certain offerings may be received (see *Ibid.* 22:18)], do not (*Menachoth* 93a).4

and to say to them - a pleonasm [seemingly redundant after "Speak to the children of Israel"], signaling the extended application of all that is stated herein, viz., just as women do not place the hand on burnt-offerings, so they do not place it on peace-offerings (Torath Cohanim).

a man - proselytes are hereby included (Yerushalmi Shekalim 1:4).6

if he offer - I might think that the offering were mandatory; it is, therefore, written "if he offer," connoting choice (Torath Cohanim).

from you - to exclude a stolen animal, which is not his (Succah 30a).8

from you - "from you," and not all of you — to exclude a heretic; "from you" — in you did I make this distinction [between heretic and non-heretic] and not in gentiles [from whom offerings may be accepted indiscriminately] (Chullin 5a).9

an offering to the L-rd - It was taught: R. Shimon said: Whence is it derived that one should not say: "To the L-rd a burnt-offering," "To the L-rd a meal-offering," "To the L-rd a thank-offering," "To the L-rd a peace-offering" [where the possibility exists that he might say "To the L-rd" and not complete the statement, thus taking the L-rd's name in vain], but "A burnt-offering to the L-rd," "A meal-offering to the L-rd," "A peace-offering to the L-rd," "We derive it from: "an offering to the L-rd" (Nedarim 10b). 10

an offering to the L-rd - This [the fact that it is called an offering before it is actually sacrificed] teaches us that one must verbally designate the animal as a sacrifice before he offers it up (Torath Cohanim).

from the beasts - to include men who are similar to beasts [i.e., who do not fulfill the mitzvoth], whence it is derived: Offerings are accepted from the sinners among the Jews so as to encourage them to repent, with the exception of confirmed sinners in pouring libations to idolatry and in desecrating the Sabbath (Chullin 5a).¹²

from the beasts - "from" [but not all] the beasts" — to exclude participants, active or passive, in sodomy; "from the cattle" — to exclude objects of idolatry; "from the sheep" — to exclude animals designated for idolatry; "and from the sheep" — to exclude animals which had gored men to death (Temurah 28b).¹³

from the cattle and from the sheep - "from the cattle and from the sheep," and not undomesticated animals (Zevachim 34a).14

from the cattle and from the sheep - It was taught: I might think that

one who said: "I vow a burnt-offering" must bring from both [cattle and sheep]; we are, therefore, told (*Ibid.* 3): "If his offering is a burnt-offering, from the cattle ...", and (*Ibid.* 10): "And if his offering is from the sheep ..." (*Menachoth* 91b).¹⁵

shall you [plural] offer - This teaches us that two may bring one offering (*Torath Cohanim*). 16

your offerings - This teaches us that there are communal gift-offerings [as well as individual ones]; another derivation: "your offerings" — communal offerings are subject to the same invalidating factors as individual ones (*Ibid.*).^{17,18}

1:3 If his offering is a burnt-offering, from the cattle, a male, without blemish, shall he offer it; to the door of the tent of meeting shall he bring it, according to his will, before the L-rd.

If his offering is a burnt-offering - This [the generic "burnt-offering"] teaches us that both gift burnt-offerings and mandatory burnt-offerings and their substitutes are subject to all the afore-mentioned invalidating factors (*Ibid.*).¹⁹

his offering - his offering, and not a stolen one (Bava Kamma 66b).20

his offering - to include peace-offerings as subject to the same invalidating factors (*Torath Cohanim*).²¹

from [but not all] the cattle - to exclude treifah [a "torn," ritually unfit, animal] (Menachoth 5b).²²

a male - a male and not a female. What, then, is [additionally] signified by (*Ibid.* 10): "And if his offering is from the sheep, a male shall he offer it"? This excludes an animal whose sex is in doubt and a hermaphroditic animal (*Bechoroth* 41b).²³

without blemish - Why is this [obvious factor] stated? To teach us that just as if it is not unblemished it is not acceptable as a sacrifice, so if it is not as herein prescribed, it is not acceptable as a sacrifice (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁴

shall he bring it, according to his will - The Rabbis taught: "shall he bring it" — this teaches us that he is coerced to do so; yet it is written "according to his will"! How is this to be understood? He is coerced until he says: "I want to" (Erchin 21a).^{25,26}

according to his will - This teaches us that the offering does not grant him atonement unless he wills it (*Ibid.*).²⁷

according to his will - Shmuel said: A burnt-offering requires awareness [on the part of him it is atoning for]. What novelty is Shmuel apprising us of? It has already been taught: "It does not grant him atonement unless he wills it"! Shmuel is referring to an instance in which his neighbor sets aside a burnt-offering for him. I might think that awareness is required only for his own offering but not for that of his neighbor. Shmuel, therefore, informs us otherwise (*Ibid.*).²⁸

1:4 And he shall place his hand upon the head of the burntoffering, and it shall be acceptable for him to make atonement for him.

And he shall place - The Rabbis taught: How does he "place"? The sacrificial animal stands to the north [of the altar] with its face to the west, and the "placer" stands to the east with his face to the west, and he places his two hands between the horns of the animal (with nothing intervening between him and the animal) and he makes confession: with a sin-offering, for the sin in question; with a guilt-offering, for the guilt in question; and with a burnt-offering, for the transgression of a positive commandment or a positive-linked negative commandment (Yoma 36a).²⁹⁻³¹

And he shall place - "Placing" may be performed the entire day, for it is written "And he shall place," followed by (*Ibid.* 5) "And he shall slaughter." Just as slaughtering may be performed the entire day, as it is written (*Ibid.* 19:6): "On the day that you slaughter it," so "placing" may be performed the entire day (*Megillah* 20b).³²

And he shall place - "Placing" is not performed on a bamah [a temporary altar], for it is written (*Ibid.* 3): "to the door of the tent of meeting shall he bring it ... before the L-rd (*Ibid.* 4) and he shall place"

[likewise, "before the L-rd," the Shechinah (the Divine Presence) being a prerequisite for "placing." In a bamah, however, the Shechinah is absent] (Zevachim 119b).³³

And he shall place - A blind man does not "place." What is the reason? It is derived from the "placing" of the elders of the congregation [i.e., the Sanhedrin] (*Ibid.* 4:15): "And the elders of the congregation shall place their hands"]. Just as there, a blind man does not "place" [a blind man being ineligible for Sanhedrin], here, too, a blind man does not "place" (*Menachoth* 93a).³⁴

And he shall place his hand - "and he shall place his hand," and not the hand of his servant, and not the hand of his messenger, and not the hand of his wife (*Ibid.* b).³⁵

on the head - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall place his hand on the head," and not on the neck, and not on the back, and not on the chest. Abba Beyirah in the name of R. Eliezer b. Yaakov said: And not on the sides (*Ibid.*).³⁶

on the head - his hand "on the head," and not on top of his other hand (Torath Cohanim).³⁷

on the head of the burnt-offering - to exclude the burnt-offering of a bird, which does not require "placing" (*Ibid.*). 38

and it shall be acceptable for him - Now does "placing" effect atonement? Is it not only through the blood that atonement is effected? What, then, is the intent of "And he shall place ... and it shall be acceptable"? This teaches us that if he disregards "placing" his atonement is not optimal — whence it is derived that the omission of "placing" does not invalidate the offering (Yoma 5a). 39

and it shall be acceptable for him to atone - "for him" to atone," and not for his neighbor to atone [whence it is derived that the sprinkling of the blood must be intended for the owner of the offering] (Zevachim 4b).⁴⁰

to make atonement for him - It was taught: R. Shimon said: "and it shall be acceptable to him to make atonement for him" [lit., "upon him," i.e., binding upon him] — What is upon him he is obliged to

make restoration for [if it goes lost], and what is not upon him, he is not obliged to make restoration for — whence it is derived that vow offerings [e.g., "I take it upon myself to bring a burnt-offering"] oblige restoration, whereas gift-offerings [e.g., "This animal is to be a burnt-offering"] do not oblige restoration (Megillah 8a).⁴¹

1:5 And he shall slaughter the bullock before the L-rd, and the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall present the blood, and they shall sprinkle the blood on the altar roundabout, which is at the door of the tent of meeting.

And he shall slaughter - and in reference to receiving the blood it is written (*Ibid.*): "and the sons of Aaron shall present." From "receiving" onwards is the *mitzvah* of the priesthood — whence we derive that a non-priest may slaughter (*Yoma* 27a).⁴²

And he shall slaughter - "and he shall slaughter" — whence we derive that a single witness suffices in cases of ritual prohibition (Chullin 10b). 43

And he shall slaughter - Slaughtering is juxtaposed with "placing" [(*Ibid.* 4): "And he shall place"], to teach us that just as bodily purity is a prerequisite for "placing" [in that it is performed (*Ibid.* 3) "before the L-rd"], so is it a prerequisite for slaughtering (*Zevachim* 32a).⁴⁴

And he shall slaughter - Slaughtering is juxtaposed with "placing," to teach us that slaughtering must follow immediately upon "placing" (Menachoth 93b).⁴⁵

And he shall slaughter - Slaughtering is juxtaposed with "placing" to teach us that where "placing" is performed [i.e., in the azarah, the Temple enclosure], there slaughtering is performed (*Ibid.*).46

And he shall slaughter - R. Kahane said: Whence is it derived that the locus of slaughtering is the neck? From "and he shall slaughter" [veshachat] — From the place that the animal bends [shach], (i.e., from the neck), chatehu [cleanse it (ritually)] (Chullin 27a).47

And he shall slaughter - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "Veshachat" connotes drawing [the knife] across [the neck — as

opposed to hacking the head off], as in (Jeremiah 9:8): "A drawn-forth [shachut] arrow is their tongue" — whence it is derived that if he decapitated the animal in one stroke it is ritually unfit (Ibid. 30b). 48

And he shall slaughter the bullock - There must be intent to slaughter the bullock — whence it is derived that if sanctified animals are slaughtered unintentionally they are ritually unfit (*Ibid.* 13a).⁴⁹

the bullock before the L-rd - "The bullock before the L-rd," and not the slaughterer before the L-rd [i.e., theoretically, if the slaughterer stood in the azarah and performed shechitah with a long knife, it would be valid] (Zevachim 32a). 50

and shall present - This refers to the receiving of the blood, the Torah referring to it as "presentation" to teach us that its presentation is not distinct from its reception and that it must, therefore, be performed with the appropriate intent (*Ibid.* 4a).^{51,52}

and the sons of Aaron shall present - This refers to the receiving of the blood, and it is written "the sons of Aaron" — and not the daughters of Aaron — whence it is derived that the receiving is done by men and not by women (Kiddushin 36a).⁵³

the sons of Aaron, the priests - What is the intent of [the seemingly redundant]"the sons of Aaron, the priests"? That the receiving must be performed by a bona fide priest [(this, from "the sons of Aaron")] who must be wearing the priestly vestments [(this, from "the priests")] (Zevachim 13a).⁵⁴

and they shall sprinkle the blood on the altar roundabout - If it were written only "and they shall sprinkle," I might think that one flinging of blood were intended; it is, therefore, written "roundabout." If only "roundabout" were written, I might think that the blood must encompass the altar as a string; it is, therefore, written "and they shall sprinkle." How is this effected? He sprinkles the blood in such a manner that it takes the form of the Greek letter gamma [spreading from the corner of the altar to both of its sides] (Ibid. 53b).55

and they shall sprinkle the blood - Why is "blood" written twice ["...present the blood and they shall sprinkle the blood"]? To teach us

that if the blood of one offering intermingled with that of another the offering is still valid (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵⁶

and they shall sprinkle the blood - Why is "blood" written twice ["... present the blood is to be sprinkled "on the altar"]? Round the edges of the corners (Eruvin 57a).⁵⁷

on the altar roundabout - Applications of blood roundabout are not elemental in bamah [temporary altar] sacrifices, for it is written "and they shall sprinkle the blood on the altar roundabout, which is at the door of the tent of meeting" [— that altar only] (Zevachim 119b).⁵⁸

1:6 And he shall flay the burnt-offering and he shall cut it into its pieces.

And he shall flay - "And he shall flay" — first he flays the whole animal; then he cuts it into pieces (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵⁹

And he shall flay the burnt-offering - Anything that is a "burnt-offering" requires flaying [even a burnt-offering lacking the proper intent on the part of the owner] (*Ibid.*).60

And he shall cut it - "it" — if it is still in its state of fitness, and not if it has become unfit [prior to flaying, in which case the animal is burned whole] (Zevachim 85a).61

And he shall cut it into its pieces - [How does he cut it? Limb by limb, but he does not cut the limbs into pieces], as it is written: "and he shall cut it into its pieces" — "it" into its [pre-existing] pieces [i.e., limbs], and not its pieces into pieces (Chullin 11a).62

And he shall cut it into its pieces - "it" into its pieces and not its pieces into pieces. But let us fear lest the brain membrane has been perforated [in which case the animal is unfit]! We infer from this [the fact that we do not entertain this fear] that we follow the majority [of instances, in which there is no perforation] (*Ibid.*).63,64

1:7 And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar and they shall arrange wood upon the fire.

And the sons of Aaron shall put - It was taught: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar" — even though fire descends from Heaven, it is a *mitzvah* to bring man-made fire (*Yoma* 21b).65

And the sons of Aaron shall put - It was taught: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar" — this teaches us that the igniting of the kindling wood must be through a bona fide priest in priestly attire (Ibid. 24b).66

the sons of Aaron the priest - "the priest" — in his priesthood. This teaches us that if the high priest attired himself in the vestments of a lesser priest and officiated, his service is invalid (Zevachim 18a).⁶⁷

fire upon the altar - It was taught: R. Shimon said: Whence do we derive that the kindling wood must be ignited on top of the altar [and not on the ground]? From the verse: "and the sons of Aaron the priest shall place fire upon the altar" (Yoma 45a).⁶⁸

and they shall arrange - It was taught: R. Shimon b. Yochai said: Whence is it derived that the daily afternoon offering requires two logs of wood carried by two priests? From "and they shall arrange the wood [lit., woods]. "If this does not refer to the daily morning offering, it being stated in that respect (*Ibid.* 6:5): "and the priest [sing.] shall kindle wood on it every morning," understand it as referring to the daily afternoon offering (*Ibid.* 26b).69

wood upon the fire - This teaches us that it is a mitzvah to kindle the fire before arranging the wood (Yerushalmi Yoma 2:1).⁷⁰

1:8 And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall arrange the pieces, the head, and the suet upon the wood, which is upon the fire, which is upon the altar.

And they shall arrange - We might think that one priest arranged all the pieces; we are, therefore, told "and they shall arrange." How is this done? One priest arranges two pieces (Torath Cohanim).

And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall arrange - "And they shall arrange" — two; "the sons of Aaron" — two; "the pieces" — two.

This teaches us that a lamb requires six priests [five for its ten limbs and one for washing the innards and the legs] (Yoma 27a).⁷²

the sons of Aaron, the priests - "the priests" — in their priesthood. This teaches us that if a lesser priest attired himself in the vestments of the high priest and officiated, his service is invalid (*Zevachim* 18a).⁷³

the pieces, the head - Was not the head in the category of all the pieces? Why, then, is it singled out? The verse (*Ibid.* 6): "And he shall flay the burnt-offering and he shall cut it" refers to flayed pieces only. Whence would I include [for arrangement] the head, that has already been severed [before the body is flayed]? For this reason it is stated "the head" (*Chullin* 27a)."

and the suet - [Was not the suet in the category of all the pieces? Why, then, is it singled out?] As we were taught: How was it done? The fat was placed on the site of slaughter [the throat] and brought up on the altar [together with the head] — this, in deference to the Exalted One (Yoma 26a).⁷⁵

upon the wood - "upon the wood, which is upon the fire" — wood that is readily flammable [to exclude the vine and the olive branch] (*Tamid* 29b). 76

which is upon the altar - This teaches us that the wood was not to project from the altar to any extent (Zevachim 62b).⁷⁷

which is upon the altar - It was taught: We might think that one who said: "I vow a burnt-offering" could bring wood and fire from his house; for this reason it is written "upon the wood, which is upon the fire, which is upon the altar" — just as the altar is communal, the wood and fire, too, must be communal. These are the words of R. Eliezer b. R. Shimon. R. Eliezer b. Shamua says: Just as the altar was not used for non-sacred purposes, so the wood and the fire were not to have been used for non-sacred purposes (*Menachoth* 22a). 78

1:9 And its innards and its legs he shall wash with water, and the priest shall cause the whole to smoke upon the altar as a burnt-offering, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

he shall wash with water - "with water," but not with wine; "with water," but not with diluted wine; "with water," — to include basin water (*Ibid.*).^{79,80}

he shall wash with water - "with water" — any amount (Torath Cohanim).81

and the priest shall cause to smoke - Why is "the priest" singled out here? To exclude flaying and slicing [from being regarded as exclusively priestly functions] (Yoma 27a).82

the whole - to include the wool on the heads of sheep, the hair on the tail of he-goats; the bones, the sinews, the horns, and the hooves, when they are still attached (*Zevachim* 85b).^{83,84}

as a burnt-offering. The offering is sacrificed in the name of six things: that of an offering, that of the offerer, that of the L-rd, that of a fire-offering, that of the savor, that of the sweetness — as it is written "as a burnt-offering, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd." "As a burnt-offering" — in the name of the offering ["in the name of the offerer" is here omitted, as it is derived from sundry sources]; "a fire-offering" — in the name of the fire-offering; "savor" — in the name of the savor; "sweet" — in the name of the pleasant odor; "to the L-rd" — in the name of the L-rd (Ibid. 46b).85

- a fire-offering, a sweet savor About the burnt-offering of beasts it is written "a fire-offering, a sweet savor"; and about the meal-offering (*Ibid.* 2:2) "a fire-offering, a sweet savor" to teach: "Both he who gives more and he who gives less, so long as his heart is inclined to Heaven" (*Menachoth* 10a). 86
- a sweet savor to the L-rd whence it is derived that in a bamah [a temporary altar, where the Divine Presence is absent], the sweet savor is not a necessary factor [so that there, the meat may be roasted before it is offered up on the altar] (Zevachim 119b).⁸⁷
- a sweet savor to the L-rd It was taught: R. Shimon b. Azzai said: Come and see what was written in the section on sacrifices. Neither "Kel" [the Almighty] nor "Elokim" [G-d] is stated, but only "Hashem" [the L-rd] so as not to give the contender an opening [to

say that there are different deities requiring different sacrifices] (Menachoth 110a).88

1:10 And if his offering is from the flock, from the sheep or from the goats, as a burnt-offering, a male without blemish shall he offer it.

And if his offering is from the flock etc. - "from the flock" — to exclude the old; "from the sheep" — to exclude the sick; "from the goats" — to exclude the malodorous (Bechoroth 41a).89

1:11 And he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward before the L-rd; and the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall sprinkle its blood on the altar roundabout.

And he shall slaughter it ... northward - [What is the intent of "it"?] — "it" northward, but the "pinching" of the bird's neck need not be northward; "it" northward, but the slaughtering of the Paschal sacrifice need not be northward; "it" northward, but the slaughterer need not stand facing northward (Menachoth 56a).90

on the side of the altar northward - its legs should be pointing north and its face pointing south — whence it is to be derived that a ramp was built to the south of the altar (Zevachim 62b).⁹¹

northward before the L-rd - It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Yaakov said: "Northward before the L-rd" — the entire north side must be unobstructed [whence we derive that the altar did not stand in the north] (Yoma 37a).⁹²

northward before the L-rd - whence it is derived that slaughtering northward is not a component of bamah [temporary altar] sacrifice [the element of "before the L-rd" lacking in a bamah] (Zevachim 119b).⁹³

1:12 And he shall cut it into its pieces, and its head, and its suet, and the priest shall arrange them on the wood, which is upon the fire, which is upon the altar.

and its head, and its suet - It was taught: Whence is it derived that head and suet precede all the limbs [for arrangement]? From "and its head, and its suet, and he shall arrange" (Yoma 25b).⁹⁴

1:13 And the innards and the legs he shall wash with water, and the priest shall present all of it and cause it to be burned upon the altar; it is a burnt-offering, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

and the priest shall present - This refers to the bringing of the limbs to the ramp (Zevachim 4a).95

1:14 And if from the fowl, a burnt-offering, is his sacrifice to the L-rd, then he shall offer from the turtle-doves or from the young pigeons his offering.

And if from the fowl - It was taught: We might think that if its wing were dried up, its leg cut off, or its eye dug out it would still be fit for an offering; we are, therefore, told: "from the fowl" — "from the fowl," and not all the fowl (Kiddushin 24b).⁹⁶

And if from the fowl - Male and female are not mentioned in respect to fowl; therefore, even a bird of doubtful sex or a hermaphroditic bird is fit for an offering (*Torath Cohanim*).⁹⁷

And if from the fowl, a burnt-offering - Why is "burnt-offering" stated here [if that has been the subject all along]? To teach us that fowl may be burnt-offerings, but not peace-offerings (*Ibid.*). 98

his offering - From here it is derived that fowl may be individual offerings but not communal offerings (*Ibid.*).99

from the turtle-doves - "from" — to exclude those that were sodomized or made objects of idol worship (Chullin 23a). 100

from the turtle-doves etc. - The Rabbis taught: Because it is written "from the turtle-doves or from the young pigeons" we might think that one who pledged fowl could not give less than two fledglings; we are,

therefore, told (*Ibid.* 15): "And the priest shall present it" — he may bring even one (*Zevachim* 65a). 101

from the turtle-doves etc. - "turtle-doves" — grown ones and not small ones; "young pigeons" — small ones and not grown ones — to exclude those at the stage when the neck feathers begin to shine [the intermediate stage], when they are unfit for offerings (Chullin 22b). 102

1:15 And the priest shall present it upon the altar, and he shall pinch off its head and cause it to smoke upon the altar, and he shall squeeze out its blood on the wall of the altar.

And the priest shall present it - Why "the priest"? That the pinching be done by the priest himself [i.e., with his fingernails, and not with a utensil] (Zevachim 65a). 103

and he shall pinch off - followed by "and cause it to smoke." Just as the smoking is not done by women [it being written (*Ibid.* 3:5): "And the sons of Aaron shall smoke it"], so the pinching is not done by women. (*Kiddushin* 36a).¹⁰⁴

and he shall pinch off - followed by "and cause it to smoke." Just as the smoking is done at the head of the altar [near the corner], so the pinching is done at the head of the altar (Zevachim 65a). 105

and he shall pinch off - followed by "and cause it to smoke." Just as in smoking, the head is separate and the body separate, so in pinching, the head must be separated from the body (*Ibid.*). 106

and he shall pinch off - I might think that it is fit even if it were slaughtered with a knife; for this reason it is written (*Ibid.* 17): "and the priest shall cause it to smoke" [i.e., only that which has been pinched, as specified] (*Torath Cohanim*). 107

and he shall pinch off its head - It is written here "and he shall pinch off its head" and in respect to the sin-offering of fowl (*Ibid.* 5:8): "and he shall pinch its head." Just as there it is pinched opposite the nape [(viz., *Ibid.*): "opposite its nape"], here, too, the pinching is opposite the nape (*Zevachim* 65a). 108

and he shall cause it to smoke - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the head and the body are smoked individually? From (*Ibid.* 1:17): "and the priest shall cause it [the body] to smoke." The smoking of the body being referred to there, how shall I understand: "and he shall cause it to smoke"? As referring to the smoking of the head (*Ibid.*). 109

and he shall squeeze - preceded by "and he shall cause it to smoke." How is it possible to squeeze out the blood after the head has been smoked? The intent must be, then, that just as the smoking is done at the head [i.e., the corner] of the altar, so the squeezing is done at the head of the altar (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁰

and he shall squeeze out its blood - "its blood" — all of it, not just part (*Ibid.*).¹¹¹

on the wall of the altar - It was taught: "and he shall squeeze out its blood on the wall of the altar" — "on the wall of the altar," and not on the wall of the ramp, and not on the wall of the heichal [the hall containing the altar]. And which wall is it that he squeezes the blood upon]? The upper wall [i.e., the wall above the line in the middle of the altar] (Ibid.). 112,113

on the wall of the altar - "on the wall," and not on the foundation (Torath Cohanim).114

1:16 And he shall remove its crop with its entrails and he shall cast it beside the altar to the east, in the place of the ashes.

its crop with its entrails - "murato" — this is the crop. I might think that he pierces through [the skin] with a knife [and extracts the dung without removing the flesh]; it is, therefore, written "with its entrails" — he takes the surrounding flesh with it (Zevachim 65a).¹¹⁵

in the place of the ashes - [We are hereby taught that it is a mitzvah to set aside a place for the ashes of the altar. If this is not stated in respect to the outer altar, concerning which it is specifically written (*Ibid.* 63): "and he shall put them (the ashes) beside the altar, understand it as applying to the inner altar]. Where is the menorah subsumed [in the requirements for a designated spot for ashes]? In ["in the place of] the

ashes" [the connotation being that where there are ashes, there is a place set aside for them] (Meilah 12a). 116,117

1:17 And he shall rend it with its covering; he shall not separate. And the priest shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, upon the wood, which is upon the fire. It is a burnt-offering, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

And he shall rend it - "Rending" is with the hand alone, as it is written (Judges 14:6): "and he rent it as he would have rent a kid [with nothing in his hand"] (Zevachim 65b). 118

and he shall rend it - "it" — one that is fit [for an offering] and not one that is unfit [and has nevertheless been placed on the altar, in which event the sacrifice is consummated]; "it" through rending, and not the burnt-offering of a beast through rending (Torath Cohanim). 119,120

with its covering - to include the skin [i.e., he need not flay it as he must the burnt-offering of a beast] (Shabbath 108a).¹²¹

he shall not separate - I might think that separation would render it unfit; the verse, therefore, continues "and the priest shall cause it to smoke" [i.e., even if it were separated] (Torath Cohanim). 122

2:1 And if a soul offer an offering of meal to the L-rd, his offering shall be of fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and he shall put frankincense upon it.

And if a soul - It was taught: All offerings may be brought in partnership, as it is written (*Ibid.* 22:18): "all of their vow-offerings and all of their gift-offerings that *they* shall offer" — with the exception of the meal-offering, concerning which it is written "And if a soul" (*Menachoth* 104b).^{1,2}

And if a soul - Why is the meal-offering singled out for the expression "a soul"? The Holy One Blessed be He said: Who is wont to bring a meal-offering? A poor man. I shall consider it as if he had offered up his soul before me (*Ibid.*).³

And if a soul - to include the anointed high priest as permitted to bring a gift meal-offering (Torath Cohanim).⁴

an offering of meal - This [the superfluous "offering"] teaches us that oil may be offered independently (Zevachim 91b).5

an offering of meal - This [the superflous "offering"] teaches us that wood may be offered independently, as it is written (*Nechemiah* 10:5): "And we have cast lots for the wood offering" (*Menachoth* 106b).⁶

his offering shall be of fine flour - It was taught: R. Yitzchak said: Why was the meal-offering singled out for the inclusion of these five oil dishes [meal, griddle, stewing pan, unleavened cakes, and unleavened wafers]? This may be compared to a king of flesh and blood who was to be dined by one of his intimates whom he knew to be poor. The king said to him: "Make me five kinds of oil dishes so that I may derive enjoyment from you" (*Ibid.* 104b).^{7,8}

and he shall put frankincense upon it - followed by (*Ibid.* 2): "And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron." This teaches us that one brings frankincense from his home [as opposed to its being suplied communally] (*Ibid.* 21b, see Rashi).9

2:2 And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron, the priests, and he shall take from there his full fistful of its fine flour and of its oil together with all its frankincense, and the priest shall smoke its "remembrance" upon the altar, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron - The "fistfuls" are the province of men and not of women, as it is written: "And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron" — the sons of Aaron and not the daughters of Aaron (Kiddushin 36a).¹⁰

and he shall take etc. - From the fistful onwards is the *mitzvah* of the priesthood, from which we infer that the pouring and the mixing of the oil are permitted to the non-priest (*Menachoth* 18b).¹¹

and he shall take from there - from the place upon which the feet of the

non-priest [the donor] stand [in the section of the azarah within bounds for non-priests] (Zevachim 63a).¹²

his full fistful - and further on it is stated (*Ibid.* 6:8): "And he shall lift from it in his fist" [implying less than a fistful]! How is this to be understood? He bends three fingers over his palm and bunches the flour in (*Menachoth* 11a).¹³

his full fistful - and further on it is stated (*Ibid.* 6:8): "And he shall lift from it in his fist." We are hereby taught that he should not make a vessel for the fistful (*Ibid.* 19b).¹⁴

his full fistful - In the "fistful," the omission of the least amount invalidates the rest. Why so? Because "his full fistful" is written twice [once here, and again (*Ibid.* 5:12) — once for the *mitzvah*, and, again, for the invalidating factor] (*Menachoth* 27a).¹⁵

of its fine flour - In the *issaron* [one-tenth of an *ephah*] of fine flour, omission of the least amount invalidates the rest, as it is written: "of its fine flour" — if the least amount is missing, it is unfit (*Ibid.*). 16

of its fine flour - "of its fine flour;" and not of the fine flour of its neighbor [i.e., another meal-offering with which it has become intermixed] (Torath Cohanim).¹⁷

of its fine flour and of its oil - The fine flour and the oil are mutually invalidating [i.e., omission of one invalidates the other]. Whence is this derived? From "of its fine flour and of its oil," and (*Ibid.* 16): "of its groats [identical with fine flour] and of its oil" [once for the *mitzvah*, and, again, for the invalidating factor] (*Menachoth* 27a).¹⁸

and of its oil - In the oil, omission of the least amount invalidates the rest. Whence is this derived? From "and of its oil" — if the least amount is missing it is unfit (*Ibid.*).¹⁹

with all its frankincense - The fistful and the frankincense are mutually invalidating. Whence is this derived? From "with all its frankincense," and (*Ibid.* 6:8): "and all of the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering" [once for the *mitzvah*, and, again, for the invalidating factor] (*Ibid.*).²⁰

2:3 And what is left from the meal-offering shall be for Aaron and his sons, holy of holies of the fire-offerings of the L-rd.

And what is left - It was taught: From when may what is left over be eaten? From when the fistful is offered up, as it is written (*Ibid.* 2): "and the priest shall smoke," followed by: "and what is left from the meal-offering shall be for Aaron and his sons" (15a).²¹

And what is left from the meal-offering - It was taught: Left-overs which underwent a diminution between the "fistful" and the smoking may not be eaten, as it is written: "and what is left from the meal-offering," and not what is left from the left-overs (Menachoth 9b).²²

And what is left from the meal-offering - [implying a complete meal-offering] to exclude [eating of what is left over in the event of] a diminished meal-offering, a diminished fistful, or non-smoking of any of its frankincense (*Ibid.*).²³

For Aaron and for his sons - for Aaron first, and then for his sons; for Aaron without apportionment, and for his sons by apportionment. And just as Aaron, the high priest, eats without apportionment, so his descendants, the high priests, eat without apportionment (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁴

2:4 And if you bring an offer of a meal-offering, baked in an oven, [it shall be] fine flour, unleavened cakes, mixed with oil, or unleavened wafers spread with oil.

And if you bring - The Rabbis taught: "Vechi takriv" — "if you bring"; it is optional, not mandatory (Menachoth 63a).²⁵

an offer of a meal-offering - It was taught: R. Yehudah said: Whence is it derived that if one says: "I take upon myself a baked meal-offering" that he may not bring part cakes and part wasers? From "an offer of a meal-offering" — it is one offer that I indicated to you, and not two or three (Ibid.).²⁶

baked in an oven - The Rabbis taught: "baked in an oven" — and not

baked in a brazier, or on hot tiles, or in the improvised fire places of the Arabs (*Ibid.*).²⁷

mixed with oil - The Rabbis taught: "unleavened cakes mixed with oil, or unleavened wafers spread with oil" — cakes mixed, and not wafers mixed; wafers spread, and not cakes spread. How does this follow [i.e., perhaps no such distinction is intended]? Rava answered: It follows from the fact that the Torah nowhere departs from this pattern to write "cakes spread" and wafers mixed" (Menachoth 75a).²⁸

2:5 And if a meal-offering [baked] on a griddle is your offering, fine flour mixed with oil, unleavened bread shall it be.

And if a meal-offering [baked] on a griddle - It was taught: R. Chanina b. Gamliel said: The grid le was flat and what was baked thereon [accordingly] hard [so as not to overflow]. Where do we see this? In (*Ibid.* 7:9): "and everything that was made in the stewing pan and on the griddle" (*Ibid.* 63a).²⁹

your offering - It is stated here: "your offering," and in respect to a meal-offering of the stewing pan (*Ibid.* 7): "your offering." Just as there, oil must be placed in the vessel [before the flour is put in, as it is written (*Ibid.*): "fine flour in oil shall it be made,"] here, too, oil must be placed in the vessel (*Ibid.* 74b).³⁰

fine flour mixed - The Rabbis taught: "fine flour mixed" — this teaches us that the flour is mixed with oil and not the cakes (*Ibid.* 75a).³¹

unleavened bread shall it be - I might think that this is merely a *mitzvah* specification; it is, therefore written: "shall it be" — it is a categorical requirement (*Menachoth* 53a).³²

unleavened bread shall it be - ["tihyeh," similar to] "hachyeh" — "keep it alive" [i.e., in guarded condition], whence it is derived that all the meal-offerings are kneaded with luke-warm water and guarded against fermentation (*Ibid.*).³³

2:6 You shall break it in pieces and pour oil upon it; it is a meal-offering.

You shall break it in pieces - "it" — to exclude the two loaves and the show-bread (*Ibid.* 75a).³⁴

You shall break it in pieces - The Rabbis taught: "You shall break it"

— I might think only in two; it is, therefore, written: "pieces." If
"pieces," I think it should be made into crumbs; it is, therefore, written:
"it" — "it" into pieces [so that there are four pieces], and not its pieces into pieces (*Ibid.* b).³⁵

and pour oil upon it - "it," — to exclude a meal-offering baked in an oven (*Ibid.* a).³⁶

it is a meal-offering - to include all meal-offerings for breaking of pieces and pouring of oil (*Ibid.* 75a).³⁷

2:7 And if a meal-offering of the stewing pan is your offering, of fine flour in oil shall it be made.

And if a meal-offering of the stewing pan - It was taught: R. Chanina b. Gamliel said: The stewing pan was deep and what was baked thereon [accordingly] soft. Where do we see this? In (*Ibid.* 7:9): "and everything that was made *in* the stewing pan and on the griddle" (*Ibid.* 63a). 38

your offering - It is written here: "your offering," and in respect to the meal-offering of the griddle (*Ibid.* 5): "your offering"; just as there, there are pouring and mixing, here, too, there are pouring and mixing (*Ibid.* 74b).³⁹

of fine flour in oil shall it be made - This teaches us that it is first necessary to place oil into the vessel (*Ibid.*).⁴⁰

2:8 And you shall bring the meal-offering that shall be made of these to the L-rd; and he shall present it to the priest, and he shall touch it to the altar.

And you shall bring - to include the meal-offering of the *omer* and the meal-offering of a *sotah* for "touching," it being written there [too, as it is here] (*Ibid.* 23:10): "and you shall bring the *omer*," and (*Numbers* 5:15): "and he shall bring her [the *sotah*'s] offering" (*Ibid.* 60b).⁴¹

And you shall bring the meal-offering - This teaches us that the entire meal-offering [and not just the fistful] requires "touching." This suffices for a gift-meal offering [that being the type under discussion]. Whence do I derive it [the necessity of "touching"] for an obligatory meal-offering? From "the meal-offering" [implying anything which is termed a "meal-offering," voluntary or obligatory] (Ibid. a). 42,43

that shall be made of these - "of these" — to exclude the bringing of a gift meal-offering made of barley (*Ibid.* b).⁴⁴

and they shall present it - followed by "and he shall touch it." "Touching" is likened to presenting. Just as it is presented to the priest in a vessel, so the priest touches it [to the altar] in a vessel (Sotah 14b).⁴⁵

and he shall touch it to the altar - whence it is derived that "touching" is not an element of bamah [temporary altar] sacrifice (Zevachim 119b).46

2:9 And the priest shall lift from the meal-offering its remembrance, and he shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

And the priest shall lift - I might think in a vessel; it is, therefore, written (*Ibid.* 6:8): "And he shall lift from it in his fist" — just as there, "in his fist," so, here, in his fist (*Menachoth* 61a).⁴⁷

from the meal-offering - It was taught: If the meal-offering were diminished between the fistful and the smoking, R. Yochanan says: The fistful may be smoked thereon. Why so? For it is written: "And the priest shall lift from the meal-offering" — from what [at the time of the lifting] was a [complete] meal-offering (*Ibid.* 9b).⁴⁸

2:10 And what is left from the meal-offering shall be for Aaron

and his sons, holy of holies of the fire-offerings of the L-rd.

2:11 All of the meal-offering that you offer up to the L-rd shall not be made of leaven; for all leaven and all honey, you shall not cause to smoke from it a fire-offering to the L-rd

All of the meal-offering - "All" — to include the rest of the meal-offerings [(even those where there is no fistful)] in the prohibition against leavening (*Ibid.* 57a).⁴⁹

All of the meal-offering - The Rabbis taught: If it were written only: "that you offer up to the L-rd shall not be made of leaven," I would say that this applies only to the fistful; it is, therefore, written: "All of the meal-offering," to include the entire offering [in the prohibition against leavening] (Ibid.). 50

that you offer up - to include the show - bread in the prohibition against leavening (*Ibid.*). 51

that you offer up to the L-rd - [implying] an acceptable offering and not one that is invalid — whence it is derived that one who allows an acceptable offering to ferment is liable, but one who allows an unacceptable offering to ferment is not liable (*Ibid.* 57a). 52

it shall not be made of leaven - R: Chiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Yochanan: All agree that one who causes [additional] fermentation after [prior] fermentation is liable. Why so? It is written here: "it shall not be made of leaven," and elsewhere (*Ibid.* 6:10): "It shall not be baked with leaven" [implying a continual prohibition against leaven] (*Ibid.* 56b).⁵³

for all leaven - The Rabbis taught: "You shall not cause leaven to smoke." This implies all of it [i.e., the full measure of prohibited leaven, viz., the size of an olive]. Whence do we derive that even part of it [is included in the prohibition]? From "all [leaven"]. Whence do we derive that even an admixture [of leavening and non-leavening is included in the prohibition]? From "for [all leaven"] (Ibid. 58a).

all leaven and all honey - Why is "all" mentioned separately in respect to leaven and honey [instead of "all leaven and honey"]? For there is a factor relating to leaven which does not relate to honey, and there is a factor relating to honey which does not relate to leaven. There is something in the class of leaven [i.e., the two loaves] which is permitted in the sanctuary, but nothing in the class of honey which is permitted in tie sanctuary. Honey is permitted in what is left from the meal-offering, but leaven is not permitted in what is left from the meal-offering (*Ibid.*).55-57

you shall not cause to smoke from it a fire-offering - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one offers up [together with leaven or honey] flesh [left over] from a sin-offering, or from a guilt-offering, or from higher order or lower order sacrifices, or what is left over from the *omer* or from the two loaves or from the show - bread or from meal-offerings — that he is in violation of a negative commandment? From: "You shall not cause to smoke from it a fire-offering to the L-rd" — all in the category of fire-offerings are included in the prohibition against smoking [with leaven or honey] (*Ibid.* 57b). 58

2:12 As a first offering you may offer them up to the L-rd, but they shall not come to the altar for a sweet savor.

As a first offering-What is a "first offering"? The two loaves and the first-fruits. [The two loaves were leavened, and the first-fruits could contain the honey of figs and dates] And why are they called "first"? Because they precede all of the meal-offerings [to be brought from the grain of that year]. And thus it is written [in respect to the two loaves] (Numbers 28:26): "when you offer a new meal offering to the L-rd" [and in respect to the first-fruits (Exodus 23:19): "The first of the first-fruits of your land"] (Ibid. 58a, 84b). 59

you may offer them up-I might think that an individual could offer a "first offering" as a gift; it is, therefore, written: "As a first-offering you [plural] may offer them up" — communally, but not individually (*Ibid.* 58a). 60

you may offer them up - I might think that since the two loaves and the first-fruits are called "a first offering," if a different offering preceded

them they should not be offered at all. It is, therefore, written: "you may offer them up" — in any event (Torath Cohanim).61

you may offer them up - I might think that a communal gift offering could contain leaven and honey, just as an obligatory communal offering can. It is, therefore, written: "you may offer them up" — them and not the gift variety (Menachoth 58a).62

but they shall not come up to the altar. This suffices for the altar itself. Whence do I derive the ramp [to be included in the prohibition]? From: "they shall not come up to to the altar." [That being so,] I might think that the ramp is like the altar in all respects! It is, therefore, written: "you may offer them up" — it is in respect to them [leaven and honey] that the ramp is likened to the altar, but not in respect to all other things (Ibid. 57b, Zevachim 77a). 63,64

they shall not come up to the altar for a sweet savor - It was taught: "but they shall not come up to the altar for a sweet savor." You may not bring them up for a sweet savor, but you may bring them up to serve as fuel. I might think that this was true of all things [which could not be brought up to the altar]; it is, therefore, written: "you may offer them up" — you may offer them up to serve as fuel, but not other things (Zevachim 77a).65

2:13 And every offering of your meal-offering you shall salt with salt. And you shall not cut off the salt of the covenant of your G-d from your meal-offering. With all your offerings shall you offer salt.

And every offering of your meal-offering - I might think that the entire meal-offering required salt. It is, therefore, written: "offering." The offering [i.e., the fistful] requires salt, but the entire meal-offering does not require salt (Menachoth 20a).66

And every offering of your meal-offering - What is the intent of "your meal-offering." If it were merely stated: "And every offering," I would say that even wood and blood [which could be referred to as "offerings"] required salt. It is, therefore, written: "your meal-offering." Just as a meal-offering is characterized by supplementary

requirements [such as wood], so, all offerings that are so characterized (*Ibid*.). 67,68

you shall eat with salt - If "with salt" alone were stated, I would think that it were sufficient simply to flavor it, just as understanding ["flavors" a human being]; it is, therefore, written: "you shall salt." If "you shall salt" alone were stated, I would think that salt water were also permissible; it is, therefore, written: "with salt." What is the procedure. He brings the limb, places salt upon it; turns it over, places salt upon it, and offers it up (*Ibid.* 21a).^{69,70}

and you shall not cut off the salt - What is the intent of: "you shall not cut off"? Bring salt that is never cut off [from nature, as opposed to fabricated salt]. What is that? Sodomite salt. How do we know that if he cannot find Sodomite salt he may bring Astrakhan salt [of an inferior grade]? From: "With all your offerings shall you offer salt" — whatever the quality (*Ibid.*).71,72

the salt of the covenant - It is written here: "the salt of the covenant," and, elsewhere (Numbers 25:13): "a covenant of an everlasting priesthood"; just as there are no sacrifices without priesthood, there are no sacrifices without salt (Ibid. 20a). 73

the salt of the covenant - It was taught: I might think that one who brought a gift meal-offering brought salt along with it; it is, therefore, written: "the salt of the *covenant*," and, elsewhere (*Ibid.* 24:8): "from the children of Israel, an everlasting *covenant*." Just as there, [in respect to the show-bread, the salt is provided] communally; here, too, it is provided communally (*Ibid.* 21b). ^{74,75}

from your meal-offering - What are we taught hereby? I might think that just as a meal-offering, which is characterized by a "permitting" quality [i.e., the fistful "permits" the consuming of the remainder] requires salt, so all "permitters" require salt, including blood, which is a permitter [i.e., the sprinkling of the blood "permits" the sacrifices to the altar and the flesh to the priests]. It is, therefore, written: "from your meal-offering" — "from your meal-offering," and not from your blood (Ibid. 20a).76

with all your offerings - What is the intent of this? I might think that

the fistful alone required salt. Whence would I [derive the requirement of salt] to include frankincense brought independently, and that brought in censers [along with the show-bread], and the meal-offering of the priests, and of the anointed high priest, and of the libations [where there are no fistfuls], and the devoted portions of the guilt-offerings and of higher order and lower order sacrifices, and the limbs of the burnt-offering, and the burnt-offering of fowl [the salt requirement having been stated explicitly only in relation to the meal-offering]? It is, therefore, written: "With all your offerings shall you offer salt" (Ibid.)." ^{77,78}

shall you offer salt - "shall you offer" — in any event; even on the Sabbath, even in a state of uncleanliness (*Ibid.* 21a).⁷⁹

2:14 And if you offer a meal-offering of first-fruits to the L-rd, grain in the ear parched with fire, groats of the fresh ear, shall you offer the meal-offering of your first-fruits.

And if you offer - R. Yehudah said: From here ["if"] it is derived that the meal-offering of the first-fruits is destined to be suspended [with exile] and to be restored. And thus it is written (Numbers 36:4): "And if the jubilee will be for the children of Israel" — the jubilee is destined to be suspended and to be restored (Torath Cohanim).80

a meal-offering of first-fruits - It was taught: "And if you offer a meal-offering of first-fruits" — Scripture is speaking of the meal-offering of the omer (Menachoth 61b).81

grain in the ear - I would not know whether from barley or from wheat. I, therefore, deduce it. "Grain in the ear" is written in respect to Egypt [(Exodus 9:31): "for the barley was in the ear"], and it is written [here] for all generations. Just as the grain in respect to Egypt was barley, the grain respect to all generations is barley (Ibid.). 82,83

grain in the ear parched with fire - The Rabbis taught: "Grain in the ear" — as the phrase implies [i.e., the first of the harvest]; "parched with fire" — "parched" implies another object [in which the grain is placed]. How was this effected? A tube for roasting grain was there, which was perforated as a sieve, so that the fire enveloped the whole (*Ibid.* 66b), 84,85

grain in the ear parched with fire, groats of the fresh ear - I would not know whether the grain or the groats [ground grain] were to be parched. [However,] "with fire" intervenes [between "grain" and "groats," and indicates that it is the grain which is to be parched] (*Ibid.*).86

groats of the fresh ear - What is "carmel" ["of the fresh ear"]? "Rach umal" — soft and malleable. The school of R. Yishmael taught: "Car male" — fully rounded.⁸⁷

groats of the fresh ear shall you offer - [From here it is derived that it is a *mitzvah* to bring the *omer* from what is near to Jerusalem. Why so? It is written: "carmel" — soft and full (which would not be the case if it were brought from far)] (*Ibid.* 64b).88

of the fresh ear shall you offer - This teaches us that it must be fresh at the time of offering [and not just at the time of harvesting]; therefore, last year's fresh ears are not brought (*Ibid.* 84a).⁸⁹

of the fresh ear shall you offer - "shall you offer" — whatever it may be [even from the sheaves, if there is no standing grain], from any place [if it cannot be obtained near Jerusalem], even in the daytime, even on the Sabbath, even in a state of uncleanliness (*Ibid.* 72b). 90

2:15 And you shall place oil upon it, and you shall put frankincense upon it; it is a meal-offering.

And you shall place oil upon it - "upon it" oil, and not upon the show-bread oil (*Ibid.* 59a). 91

and you shall put frankincense upon it - "upon it" frankincense, and not upon the meal-offering of libations frankincense (*Ibid.*). 92

it is a meal-offering - to include the meal-offering of the eighth day [of the consecration of the Tabernacle] in the requirement of frankincense; "it" — to exclude the two loaves from the requirement of oil and frankincense (*Ibid.*). 93,94

2:16 And the priest shall burn its memorial from its pounded corn and its oil with all its frankincense, a fire-offering to the L-rd.

3:1 And if a sacrifice of peace-offerings is his offering, if from the cattle he offers, whether male or female, without blemish shall he offer it before the L-rd.

And if a sacrifice of peace-offerings - whence it is derived that he must sacrifice it in the name of a peace-offering (Zevachim 4a).

a sacrifice of peace-offerings - It was taught [Why are they called "peace-offerings"?]: For all are "at peace" with them: the blood and the devoted portions are for the altar, the breast and the thigh for the priests, and the skin and the flesh for the owners (*Torath Cohanim*).²

a sacrifice of peace-offerings [shelamim] is his offering. It was taught: R. Shimon says: A mourner does not send his offerings, for it is written: "a sacrifice of peace-offerings is his offering" — all the sacrifices that one brings he brings when he is whole ["shalem," in his mind], but he does not bring them when he is in mourning (Zevachim 99b).

if from the cattle - "cattle" — to include the eleventh in the process of tithing [where he erroneously called the tenth the ninth, the ninth the tenth, and the eleventh the tenth] as a gift-offering; "from the cattle" — to exclude the ninth in the tithing as a gift-offering (Yerushalmi Nazir 5:2).4

he offers - This ["he"] teaches us that there can be an individual gift peace-offering, but not a communal gift peace-offering (Torath Cohanim).

whether male or female - "whether male or female" — a definite male and a definite female, and not an animal whose sex is doubtful or a hermaphroditic animal (Bechoroth 42a).6

whether male or female - The Rabbis taught: "male" — to include the offspring [of a peace-offering as a peace-offering]; "female" — to include the exchange [of a peace-offering as a peace-offering]; "whether male" — to include the offspring of blemished [peace-offerings as peace-offerings]; "whether female" — to include the exchange of blemished [peace-offerings as peace-offerings] (Temurah 17b).

3:2 And he shall place his hand upon the head of his offering, and he shall slaughter it at the door of the tent of meeting; and the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall sprinkle the blood on the altar roundabout.

upon the head of his offering - "His offering" is written three times [in respect to peace-offerings]. One to exclude the offering of a gentile [from "placing"]; and one to include all partners to an offering in [the requirement of] "placing" (Ibid. 2a).⁸⁻¹¹

and he shall slaughter it - "and he shall slaughter it," (*Ibid.* 8): — to exclude non-sanctified animals from being slaughtered in the *azarah* [the Temple enclosure], etc. (*Kiddushin* 57b). 12,13

at the door of the tent of meeting - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall slaughter it at the door of the tent of meeting," (*Ibid.* 8): "and he shall sluahgter it before the tent of meeting," (*Ibid.* 13): "and he shall slaughter it before the tent of meeting," — one for the basic teaching; one to permit the sides [of the *azarah* as a permissible slaughtering site, in that they satisfy the stricture: "before the tent of meeting"]; and one to invalidate the sides of the sides [the Temple chambers, in that they do not satisfy this stricture] (Zevachim 55a,b). 14-15

at the door of the tent of meeting - R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: Peace-offerings that were slaughtered before the doors of the sanctuary were opened are invalid, it being written: "and he shall slaughter it at the door [lit., "opening"] of the tent of meeting" — when it is open, and not when it is locked (*Ibid.* b). 16

the door of the tent of meeting - R. Yochanan said: Peace-offerings that were slaughtered in the sanctuary are acceptable; for it is written: "and he shall slaughter it at the door of the tent of meeting," and the ancillary [the azarah, the site of the tent of meeting] cannot be of a higher order of sanctity than the principal [the sanctuary itself] (*Ibid.* 63a).¹⁷

3:3 And he shall offer up from the sacrifice of the peace-offering a fire-offering to the L-rd; the fat that covers the innards and all the fat that is on the innards.

And he shall offer up from the sacrifice of the peace-offering — What is the intent of "from the sacrifice of the peace-offering"? To include it as being acceptable [as a "sacrifice"] even if it were not slaughtered in its name [e.g., a burnt-offering in the name of a peace-offering, or vice versa] (Torath Cohanim).¹⁸

and all the fat - It was taught: "and all the fat that is on the innards"—
R. Yishmael says: to include the fat upon the stomach. R. Akiva says: to include the fat upon the small intestines (Chullin 49b).¹⁹

that is on the innards - It was taught: R. Akiva says: "and all the fat that is on the innards" — just as "the fat that covers" is an even layer, membranous, and easily peeled, so all that is of an even layer, membranous, and easily peeled (*Ibid.*).²⁰

that is on the innards - R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: The fat on the stomach and on the second stomach is forbidden and [eating it] is punishable by cutting-off; and this is "the fat that is on the innards" (*Ibid.* 93a).²¹

3:4 And the two kidneys and the fat which is upon them, which is on the loins, and the lobe above the liver, which is upon the kidneys, he shall remove it.

And the two kidneys - but an animal with one or three kidneys is not to be sacrificed (*Bechoroth* 39a).²²

And the two kidneys and the fat - It was taught: Fat and the two kidneys are mentioned in respect to a guilt-offering, and fat and the two kidneys are mentioned [here] in respect to peace-offerings. Just as the prohibition against fat does not apply to the embryo of a guilt-offering [there being no embryo, all guilt-offerings being male], so it does not apply to the embryo of peace-offerings (Torath Cohanim).²³

which is on the loins - R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: The fat on the coccyx is forbidden and [eating of it] punishable by cutting-off; it is subsumed in the prohibition of fat "which is on the loins" (Chullin 93a).²⁴

which is on the loins - R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: Fat

which is covered by flesh is permitted. Why so! It is written: "which is on the loins," and not what is inside the loins (*Ibid.*).²⁵

the lobe above the liver - I would not know whether to take part of the liver with the lobe or part of the lobe with the liver. Its being written (*Ibid.* 9:10): "and the lobe from the liver" indicates that part of the liver is taken with the lobe (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁶

which is upon the kidneys, he shall remove it - R. Sheshes said in the name of R. Assi: One does not incur the punishment of cutting-off for [eating] strands of fat in the kidney. Why so? It is written: "upon the kidneys," and not inside the kidneys (Chullin 93a).²⁷

he shall remove it - ["it"] though there be no kidneys; "kidneys," though there be no lobe; "he shall remove it," even one kidney (Torath Cohanim).^{27*}

3:5 And the sons of Aaron shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, upon the burnt-offering, which is upon the wood, which is upon the fire, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

And the sons of Aaron shall cause it to smoke - It is written (*Ibid.* 11): "And he shall cause it to smoke," and (*Ibid.* 16): "And he shall cause them to smoke"! "And they shall cause it to smoke" [our verse] — what is fit, and not what has become unfit [between sprinkling and smoking]; "And he shall cause it to smoke" — fats of one offering may not be mixed with those of another; "And he shall cause them to smoke" — all together. How so? [Has it not just been stated that they may not be intermixed!] Here [where they may be intermixed, the allusion is to] the tray [on which they are brought to the altar]; there [where they may not be intermixed, the allusion is to] the altar itself (Yerushalmi Pesachim 5:7). 28,29

the sons of Aaron - "Smoking" is performed by men and not by women, it being written: "And the sons of Aaron shall cause it to smoke" — the sons of Aaron and not the daughters of Aaron (Kiddushin 36a).³⁰

a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd - It is written here: "a fire-

offering," but not: "bread"; and further (*Ibid.* 11): "bread," but not: "a sweet savor"; and yet further (*Ibid.* 16): "a sweet savor," but not: "to the L-rd." Whence do we derive that all of these elements apply to each instance? From the fact that "a fire-offering" is written in respect to all, to include all the elements as common to each instance (*Torath Cohanim*).

3:6 And if his offering is from the flock, for a sacrifice of peace-offerings to the L-rd, male or female, without blemish, shall he offer it.

And if his offering is from the flock — The Rabbis taught: A Paschal offering out of its proper time, which was offered up not in its name [as a Paschal offering] is acceptable, it being written: "And if his offering is from the flock, for a sacrifice of peace-offerings" — something which comes from the flock [as does the Paschal offering] shall be a peace-offering (Zevachim 8b).³¹

3:7 If a lamb he offers for his offering, he shall offer it before the L-rd.

If a lamb - It was taught: "a lamb" — to include [for sacrifice] the tail of a Paschal lamb; "if a lamb" — to include a Paschal lamb which has passed the prescribed one-year term and peace-offerings brought in lieu of the Paschal lamb in all the mitzvoth of peace-offerings, requiring "placing," libations, and lifting of breast and thigh (Pesachim 96b). 32,33

if a lamb - It was taught: "if a lamb he offers" — the first offspring of a peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering; the second is not (*Temurah* 18b).³⁴

he offers - it is sacrificed, but the offspring of all other sanctified animals are not sacrificed (*Ibid.*).³⁵

he offers - This teaches us that there can be an individual gift peace-offering, but not a communal gift peace-offering (Torath Cohanim). 35*

3:8 And he shall place his hand upon the head of his offering,

and he shall slaughter it before the tent of meeting, and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle its blood on the altar roundabout.

3:9 And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings a fire-offering to the L-rd: its fat, the tail whole, against the rump-bone, he shall take it away; and the fat that covers the innards and all of the fat that is on the innards.

its fat, the tail - If one slaughters the sacrifice with the intention of eating the size of an olive of the skin of the tail outside [the Temple court], it is invalid. Why so? R. Huna said: The skin of the tail is not considered as the tail [for sacrificial purposes, and may be eaten; accordingly it falls under the proscription of intention to eat outside the Temple court], as it is written: "its fat, the tail," and not: "its skin, the tail" (Zevachim 28a). 36

against the rump-bone - What is "atzeh" ["the rump-bone"]? The place where the kidneys "take counsel" [yoatzoth, i.e., "convene"] (Chullin 11a).³⁷

- 3:10 And the two kidneys and the fat which is upon them, which is on the loins, and the lobe above the liver, which is upon the kidneys, he shall remove it.
- 3:11 And the priest shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, the bread of a fire-offering to the L-rd.

the bread of a fire-offering to the L-rd - see above (5): "a fire-offering etc."

3:12 And if a goat is his offering, he shall offer it before the L-rd.

And if a goat is his offering - [Why is this mentioned? To "interrupt"

the subject] to teach that a goat does not require "smoking" of the tail (Pesachim 96b).38

- 3:13 And he shall place his hand upon its head, and he shall slaughter it before the tent of meeting, and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle its blood upon the altar roundabout.
- 3:14 And he shall present from it his offering, a fire-offering to the L-rd: the fat that covers the innards and all the fat upon the innards.

And he shall present from it - "from it" — from that [the meat] to which it is attached [and he should not cut the meat before removing the devoted portions] (*Torath Cohanim*).^{38*}

- 3:15 And the two kidneys and the fat which is upon them, which is on the loins, and the lobe above the liver, which is upon the kidneys, he shall remove it.
- 3:16 And the priest shall cause them to smoke upon the altar, the bread of a fire-offering, for a sweet savor, all the fat for the L-rd.
- a fire-offering, for a sweet savor see above (5): "a fire-offering etc."
- all the fat for the L-rd to include the devoted portions of lower-order sanctity [in which class peace-offerings are included] in the prohibition against abuse of sacred objects (Meilah 15a).³⁹
- 3:17 A perpetual statute for your generations in all your dwellings: all fat and all blood you shall not eat.

in all your dwellings - Why is it necessary to state this? I might think that since it [the prohibition against fat and blood] is written in respect to sacrifices, then, when sacrifices are in force, fat and blood are

forbidden, and when sacrifices are not in force, they are not forbidden; it is, therefore, written: "in all your dwellings" (Kiddushin 37b).40

all fat and all blood - It was taught: "all fat and all blood you shall not eat." Blood is likened to fat. Just as fat is characterized by its distinctness from its flesh, so that one does not combine with the other [in the formation of prohibited quantities], so blood, being distinct from its flesh, the two do not combine with each other [in the formation of such quantities]. Emerging as an exception is the blood of reptiles. Since its blood is not distinct from its flesh, the two do combine [in the formation of prohibited quantities]. (Krituth 4b).41

and all blood - Rava said: What is the purpose of the five negative commandments stated in respect to [eating] blood? One for the blood of non-sanctified animals, one for the blood of sanctified animals, one for blood which had been covered [by earth], one for squeezed-out blood, and one for the blood of the organs (*Ibid.*).^{42,43}

- 4:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 4:2 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: A soul, if he sin unwittingly, in all of the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd which may not be done, and he do of one of these:

a soul - to include converts and servants (Torath Cohanim).

the mitzvoth of the L-rd - For [violation of] the commandments of the L-rd one brings a sin-offering, but he does not bring it for [violation of] the commands of the king or of the court (*Ibid.*).

which may not be done - I might think, since it is written: "the mitzvoth of the L-rd," that even the positive commandments are included; it is, therefore, written: "which may not be done" — only the negative commandments (Ibid.).

and he do one of these - It was taught: R. Yossi said: "and he do one of these" — Sometimes he must bring one sin-offering for all [the violations], and sometimes one offering for each one. One for all —

where there is unawareness in respect to Sabbath and awareness in respect to the forbidden labors [i.e., where he is unaware that it is Sabbath, but aware that what he is doing is forbidden on the Sabbath]; one for each one — where there is awareness in respect to Sabbath, but unawareness in respect to the forbidden labors [the rationale being that in the first instance there is only one unawareness (that of its being Sabbath), whereas in the second, there are numerous unawarenesses (one in respect to each forbidden labor)] (Sabbath 70a).

of one of these - "these" — the archetypical labors; "of these" — their derivatives (*Ibid.*).²

of one of these - I might think that he is not liable [for performance of forbidden labor on Sabbath] until he writes the *entire* name, until he weaves the *entire* garment. It is, therefore, written: "of one" [implying part of what he intended to do]. If "of one," I might think [that he is liable] even if he wrote only one letter, even if he wove only one strand; it is, therefore, written (*Ibid.*13): "one [of all the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd"]. How is this to be reconciled? He is not liable until he performs a labor which is an entity in itself [e.g., if he intended to write "Daniel" and wrote "Dan"] (*Ibid.* 103b).³

4:3 If the anointed priest shall sin in the guilt of the people, then he shall offer for his sin which he has sinned a young bullock without blemish to the L-rd for a sin-offering.

If the anointed priest - [The section opens with the (lay) individual and goes on to speak about the anointed priest, to teach that] the anointed priest is like the individual. Just as the [lay] individual who ate [forbidden food] upon the [erroneous] ruling of the beth-din is not liable [to bring a sin-offering], so the anointed priest who ate upon the ruling of the beth-din is not liable (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 2.1).4

If the anointed priest - The Rabbis taught: "priest" — to exclude a king; "anointed" — to exclude a "many-garmented" priest [who is not anointed]; "the anointed priest" — this is the high priest, who has no one that is anointed above him — to exclude the priest anointed for war, who has an anointed priest [the high priest] above him (Horiyoth 12a).

If the anointed priest shall sin - If he sinned before his appointment [to the high priesthood], and then was appointed, he is as any layman [in respect to the type of sin-offering he brings], for it is written: "If the anointed priest shall sin" — to exclude his previous sins (*Ibid.* 10a).6

in the guilt of the people - This teaches us that the anointed priest is like the people; just as the people are liable [to bring a sin-offering] only where there is an error in the ruling and [consequently,] an inadvertent sin in the deed, so the anointed priest is liable only where there is an error in the ruling and an inadvertent sin in the deed (*Ibid.* 7a).⁷

in the guilt of the people - This teaches us that the anointed priest is like the people; just as the people are not liable unless the beth-din rules partially in fulfillment [of a mitzvah] and partially in violation thereof, so the anointed priest is not liable unless he rules partially in fulfillment and partially in violation (Ibid. 12b).8

in the guilt of the people - This teaches us that the anointed priest is like the people; just as the people are not liable unless the beth-din rules in a mitzvah where deliberate violation is punishable by cutting-off and unwitting violation by a sin-offering, so the anointed priest is not liable unless he rules in a mitzvah where deliberate violation is punishable by cutting-off and unwitting violation by a sin-offering (Ibid. 8a).

then he shall offer for his sin - The Rabbis taught: "Then he shall offer for his sin which he has sinned" — this teaches us that he brings a bullock for his sin in the past, whence it is derived that an anointed priest who sinned and whose appointment expired, or one whose appointment expired and then sinned, brings a bullock (*Ibid.* 10a). 10

which he has sinned - The Rabbis ruled: I might think that if he ruled and others acted upon his [erroneous] ruling [but not he himself], he should be liable [to bring a sin-offering]; it is, therefore, written: "then shall he offer for his sin which he has sinned" — he brings it for what he has sinned and not for what others have sinned (*Ibid.* 7a). 11

which he has sinned - The Rabbis taught: If he ruled with the people [the beth-din] and sinned with the people, I might think that he brings a bullock for himself; it is, therefore, written: "then he shall offer for his sin which he has sinned" — if he sinned by himself then he brings for

himself; but if he sinned with the people, he is granted atonement with [the offering of] the people (*Ibid.*).¹²

a young bullock - If only "bullock" were stated, I might think it could be an old one; it is, therefore, written "young." If "young," I might think it could be a small one; it is, therefore, written: "bullock." What satisfies these conditions? A three-year-old (Torath Cohanim).

4:4 And he shall bring the bullock to the door of the tent of meeting before the L-rd, and he shall place his hand on the head of the bullock, and he shall slaughter the bullock before the L-rd.

And he shall bring the bullock - [It is not written: "And he shall bring it," but: "And he shall bring the bullock"] This teaches us that he must bring a bullock and not another offering in exchange for it (Ibid.).

4:5 And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bullock and bring it to the tent of meeting.

And the anointed priest shall take - And elsewhere (*Exodus* 24:6) it is written: "And Moses took half of the blood and put it into basins"; just as there, in a vessel, here, too, in a vessel (*Ibid.*).

from the blood of the bullock - If blood spilled to the ground and was gathered up, it is unfit, for it is written: "And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bullock" — "blood, from the bullock" shall he take it (Zevachim 27a).¹³

from the blood of the bullock - The Rabbis taught: "And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bullock" — from the blood of the life [i.e., with which the life goes out], and not from the blood of the skin, and not from the blood which is squeezed out (*Ibid.*).¹⁴

from the blood of the bullock - R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: The slaughterer must lift the knife high [so that blood not drip from it into the receptacle], for it is written: "And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bullock," and not from the blood of the bullock and something else (*Ibid.* b).¹⁵

from the blood of the bullock - R. Zeira said in the name of Rebbi: If one slit the ear of the bullock and then received its blood, it is unfit, for it is written: "And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bullock" — implying that it was an intact bullock at the time of receiving (*Ibid.*).¹⁶

and bring it to the tent of meeting - What is the intent of "it"? to exclude his offering for the "special" mitzvah [the mitzvah of the offering for inadvertent idol worship, which is singled out elsewhere (Shelach) for "special" mention] from the bringing of its blood to the inner altar (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 2:4).¹⁷

and bring it - the fit and not the unfit (Torath Cohanim).

4:6 And the priest shall dip his finger into the blood, and he shall sprinkle from the blood seven times before the L-rd in front of the curtain of the sanctuary.

And the priest shall dip - He shall dip and not wipe [i.e., there must be enough blood in the vessel for him to dip his finger into] (Zevachim 93b).¹⁸

his finger - ["et etzbao" ("et" — to include a growth on the finger [as part of the finger, so that it is not regarded as an invalidating partition] (Ibid. 40b).¹⁹

his finger - It is written here: "his finger," and, in respect to a leper (*Ibid.* 14:16): "his finger." Just as "his finger" of a leper is the index finger of the right hand, "his finger" here is also the index finger of the right hand (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁰

into the blood - implying that the blood must contain the required amount for dipping [seven dippings] from the beginning [and not that the needed amount be placed in it for each successive dipping] (Zevachim 93b).²¹

and he shall sprinkle - [the anointed priest — to exclude the ordinary priests] (Kiddushin 36b).²²

and he shall sprinkle - "and he shall sprinkle" — and not drip, and not fling (*Torath Cohanim*).

and he shall sprinkle from the blood - [Why mention "from the blood"?] From the blood previously referred to [i.e., that in the receptacle] — to exclude the blood left over on the finger (Zevachim 93b).²³

seven times - seven times, and not seven drops (Torath Cohanim).24

seven times - He must count seven times, and not "one and seven" [as he counts on Yom Kippur] (*Ibid.*).

in front of the curtain of the sanctuary - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: Why is the curtain of the sanctuary mentioned in respect to the bullock of the anointed priest and not in respect to the bullock brought for a communal oversight (*Ibid.* 16)? This can be compared to a king of flesh and blood whose subjects have disobeyed him. If a minority have disobeyed, his hegemony endures, but if a majority have disobeyed, his hegemony does not endure (*Zevachim* 41b).²⁵

in front of the curtain of the sanctuary - Chezkiah taught: Why is the curtain of the sanctuary mentioned in respect to the bullock of the anointed priest and not in respect to the bullock brought for a communal oversight? To teach that where there is an anointed priest there is an ark, and where there is no anointed priest there is no ark [as was, indeed, borne out in the history of the Temple, both existing concurrently until King Yoshiyahu hid the anointing oil and the ark during the period of the first Temple] (Yerushalmi Ta'anith 1:2).²⁶

4:7 And the priest shall put the blood on the corners of the altar of the smoking of the incense before the L-rd, which is in the tent of meeting; and all the blood of the bullock he shall pour at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tent of meeting.

before the L-rd - What is the intent of this? R. Nechemiah said: To teach that the altar is "before the L-rd," but the priest is not "before the L-rd." How is this effected? He stands outside the altar [and not

between the altar and the curtain] and sprinkles [from there upon the curtain] (Yoma 58b).²⁷

which is in the tent of meeting - What are we hereby taught? Is it not already written: "before the L-rd"? We are taught that if the roof of the sanctuary were breached, he did not sprinkle (Zevachim 40a).²⁸

and all the blood of the bullock - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: The slaughterer must receive all the blood of the bullock, as it is written: "and all the blood of the bullock he shall pour." And though this is written in respect to what remains of the blood [after sprinkling], if it cannot apply to what remains (all of the blood not being there), apply it to the receiving of the blood [at the slaughtering of the bullock] (Ibid. 25a).²⁹

the blood of the bullock - Why is "the bullock" mentioned? To teach us about the bullock of Yom Kippur that it requires the pouring of blood at the foundation (*Ibid.* 52a).³⁰

he shall pour - "he shall pour," and not drip, and not sprinkle, and not fling (Torath Cohanim).

he shall pour at the foundation of the altar - upon the *roof* of the foundation (Zevachim 52a).³¹

at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering. The Rabbis taught: "the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering," and not the foundation of the inner altar; "the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering" — the inner altar itself has no foundation; "the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering" — Apply the foundation [i.e., the mitzvah of pouring the blood at the foundation] to the altar of the burnt-offering [i.e., the sacrifice of a burnt-offering"] (Ibid. 51a).³²

which is at the door of the tent of meeting - What remained of the blood [of the inner sin-offerings] would be poured at the western foundation of the outer altar. Why so? For it is written: "at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tent of meeting" — [indicating the side of the foundation — the western side] that he came to first [upon leaving the tent of meeting] (*Ibid.*).³³

4:8 And all the fat of the bullock of the sin-offering he shall take from it: the fat which covers the innards and all the fat which is on the innards.

the fat of the bullock of the sin-offering - [It is not written: "and all its fat," but: "and all the fat of the bullock of the sin-offering"] to include the fat of the bullock of Yom Kippur and the goats brought for the sin of idol worship for the two kidneys, the lobe above the liver, and all of the other specifications (Torath Cohanim).

he shall take from it - [What is the intent of "from it"?] That he should not cut the meat before removing the devoted portions (Menachoth 77b).³⁴

4:9 And the two kidneys and the fat that is upon them, which is on the loins, and the lobe above the liver, which is upon the kidneys, he shall remove it.

And the two kidneys - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: Why are the lobe and the two kidneys mentioned in respect to the bullock of the anointed priest and not in respect to the bullock brought for a communal oversight (*Ibid.* 19)? This can be compared to a king of flesh and blood who grew angry with one he loved and played down his offense because of his affection for him (*Zevachim* 41b).³⁵

4:10 As it is removed from the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall cause them to burn upon the altar of the burnt-offerings.

As it is removed, etc. - What is to be learned from the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings at this point? The bullock of the anointed priest is being likened to the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings. Just as the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings [is not invalidated] until there is an act upon the outer altar and a thought [to eat of the flesh] outside [the Temple court], so is it with the bullock of the anointed priest (*Ibid.* 44b). 36,37

As it is removed, etc. - What is to be learned from the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings at this point? "This comes to teach and ends up learning." The ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings is being likened to the ox of the anointed priest. Just as the ox of the anointed priest is subject to me'ilah [profanation of the devoted portions], so the ox of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings is subject to me'ilah (Chullin 117a). 38,39

4:11 And the skin of the bullock and all its flesh, with its head and with its legs, and its innards and its dung.

with its head - I might think that it is burned whole; I, therefore, induce: It is written here: "its head" and "its legs," and in respect to a burnt-offering (*Ibid.* 1:8 and 9): (its) "head" and "its legs" — just as there, the animal is first cut into pieces, here, too, it is first cut into pieces (*Zevachim* 50a)⁴⁰

and its innards and its dung - I might think that, as in the case of a burnt-offering, the animal is flayed here, too. It is, therefore, written: "and its innards and its dung" — just as its dung is in its innards, so its flesh is in its skin (*Ibid.*).41

and its innards and its dung - followed by: "And he shall take [the entire bullock"]. This teaches us that he shall take it out entire [and not cut into pieces] (*Ibid.*).42

4:12 And he shall take the entire bullock outside the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out; and he shall burn it on wood with fire. Where the ashes are poured out shall it be burned.

And he shall take the entire bullock - This teaches us that he takes out all of it (Yoma 50a).43

outside the camp - Outside the three camps, or outside one camp? When it is written in respect to the bullock of the congregation (*Ibid.* 21): "And he shall take the bullock outside the camp," it is not really necessary to state this, for it is already written there: "and he shall burn

it as he burned the first bullock." The intent, then, is to add a second camp. And when it is written in respect to the ashes (*Ibid.* 6:4): "outside the camp," it is not really necessary to state this, for it is already written here: "where the ashes are poured out." The intent, then, is to add a third camp (*Zevachim* 105b).⁴⁴

where the ashes are poured out - [What is the intent of "the ashes"?] To teach us that ashes should be there and that the place be designated for ashes [of the altar] (*Ibid.* 106a).⁴⁵

and he shall burn it - the fit and not the unfit (Torath Cohanim). 45*
on wood - even straw and rakings (Ibid.). 46

on wood with fire - "with fire," and not with boiling lime or boiling gypsum (Pesachim 75a).47

shall it be burned - What is the intent of this? To teach us that it must be burned [in any event], even if there are no ashes there and even if the fire has consumed most of it. [It must be burned completely] (*Ibid.*).⁴⁸

4:13 And if the whole congregation of Israel err, and a thing be hid from the eyes of the congregation, and they do one of all the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd which may not be done and they are guilty,

And if the whole congregation of Israel - I might think that it is the congregation [of the populace] that is being referred to; I, therefore, induce: It is written here: "congregation" and elsewhere [(Numbers 35:24): "And the congregation shall judge," (Ibid. 25): "And the congregation shall save"]. Just as "congregation" there refers to beth-din, so "congregation" here refers to beth-din. I might think that this is a beth-din of twenty-three; it is, therefore, written: "the congregation of Israel" — the congregation which is distinctive in Israel. Which is that? The Great Sanhedrin [of seventy-one] (Torath Cohanim).⁴⁹

the whole congregation of Israel - What is the intent of "the whole congregation"? This is what is intended: if the entire Sanhedrin is there, it is accounted a ruling; if not, it is not accounted a ruling (*Horiyoth* 3b).⁵⁰

the congregation of Israel - If there were in the Sanhedrin one who was not fit to judge, they are exempt [from a sin-offering]. Why so? It is written here: "congregation" and elsewhere [(Numbers 35:24): "And the congregation shall judge," (Ibid. 25): "And the congregation shall save"]. Just as there, all are fit to judge, here, too, all must be fit to judge (Ibid. 4b). 51

the congregation of Israel - If beth-din ruled [erroneously], and one tribe acted upon their ruling, then that tribe is liable [to bring a sin-offering]. And there is liability only upon the ruling of the Great Sanhedrin itself, as it is written: "And if the whole congregation of Israel sin" — the congregation of Israel [i.e., the Great Sanhedrin], and not the congregation of the tribe (Ibid. 5a). 52,53

err and a thing be hid - this teaches us that there is liability only where there is error in judgment and unwittingness in act (*Ibid.* 7b).⁵⁴

and a thing be hid - The Rabbis taught: "and a thing [i.e., a detail of the mitzvah] be hid" — and not that the entire mitzvah be uprooted. Why so? It is written here: "a thing," and in respect to a rebellious elder; "a thing" (Deuteronomy 17:8): "If there be hidden from you a thing", (Ibid. 11): "Do not go astray from the thing." Just as there, "from the thing," and not all the thing; here, too, "a thing," and not all the thing (Ibid.4a).55

from the eyes of the congregation - beth-din, together with [the inadvertent act of] the congregation (Ibid. 5a).⁵⁶

from the eyes of the congregation - Four "congregations" are written ["from the eyes of the congregation" ("the" having the connotation of an additional congregation) and (Ibid. 14): "then the congregation shall offer up")]: [one, for the basic law], one, for the liability of each tribe individually [a tribe also being referred to as a "congregation"], one, to indicate that the ruling relates to beth-din and the act to the populace, and one, for the "adhesion" principle [i.e., if most of the Jews sinned, though they constitute a minority of the tribes, or if most of the tribes sinned, though they constitute a minority of the Jews, the minority "adheres" to the majority and each tribe must bring a sin-offering] (Ibid. 5a). 57-60

from the eyes of the congregation, and they do - I might think that if beth-din ruled and beth-din committed the sin they are liable; it is, therefore, written: "the congregation, and they do" — the act relates to the congregation and the ruling to beth-din (Ibid.).61

and they are guilty - There is no liability [to bring a communal sinoffering] for [inadvertent violation of] a positive commandment
[(Numbers 5:2): "and they shall send from the camp every leper, etc."]
and a negative commandment [(Ibid. 3): "and they shall not defile their
camps"] in respect to [uncleanliness in] the sanctuary. Why so? It is
written here [in respect to a communal sin-offering]: "and they are
guilty," and in respect to an individual sin-offering (Ibid. 27): "and he
be guilty." Just as there, the liability is for the standard sin-offering,
here, too [there is a communal sin-offering only for such a sin which, if
committed by an individual, would call for] the standard sin-offering
[whereas the sin of uncleanliness in the sanctuary, on the individual
level, calls for an oleh veyored sacrifice] (Ibid. 8b).62,63

and they are guilty - This teaches us that just as punishment is exacted from the individual, so is it exacted from the populace (*Torath Cohanim*).

4:14 If the sin become known wherein they have sinned, then the congregation shall offer a young bullock for a sin-offering, and they shall bring it before the tent of meeting.

If the sin become known - The Rabbis taught: If it became known to the people that beth-din ruled erroneously [so that it is clear to them that whatever the ruling of beth-din was, they have sinned; but they do not recall the specific ruling], I might think they would be liable [to bring a sin-offering]; it is, therefore written: "If the sin become known," and not: if the sinners become known (Horiyoth 5a).64

If the sin become known - If beth-din is in doubt as to whether their ruling was erroneous or not, they do not bring a conditional guilt-offering, for it is written: "if the sin become known" — they are not liable until they are apprised of the sin (Rambam 12:2 Shegagoth).65

wherein they have sinned - [lit., "which they have sinned upon it"].

They are not liable until they rule in an instance where intentional commission is punishable by cutting-off and unintentional commission by a sin-offering. Why so? It is written here: "upon it," and elsewhere (*Ibid.* 18:18): "to reveal her nakedness upon her." Just as there, intentional commission is punishable by cutting-off and unintentional commission by a sin-offering; here, too, the instance is one in which intentional commission is punishable by cutting-off and unintentional commission by a sin-offering (*Horiyoth* 8a).66

then the congregation shall offer - If one tribe sinned, it, too, brings a bullock. Why so? One tribe is also called a congregation, as it is written (II *Chronicles* 20:5): "And Yehoshafat stood in the congregation [tribe] of Yehudah" (*Ibid.* 5b).⁶⁷

4:15 And the elders of the congregation shall place their hands upon the head of the bullock before the L-rd, and he shall slaughter the bullock before the L-rd.

And the elders of the congregation shall place - It was taught: R. Shimon said: The "placing" is performed by three elders. Why so? [The minimum of] "elders" is two, and beth-din cannot be equi-balanced [a condition which could result in a judicial stalemate]; accordingly, another elder is added to them (Sanhedrin 13b).68

the elders of the congregation - the distinctive of the congregation [i.e., the Great Sanhedrin] (*Ibid.*).⁶⁹

their hands - the [two] hands of each elder [alternately] (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 1:8).70

upon the head of the bullock - What is the intent of "the bullock"? To teach that a bullock requires "placing," and the goats brought for the sin of idol worship do not require placing (Menachoth 92a).⁷¹

- 4:16 And the anointed priest shall bring of the blood of the bullock to the tent of meeting.
- 4:17 And the priest shall dip his finger from the blood, and he

shall sprinkle seven times before the L-rd in front of the curtain.

- 4:18 And of the blood he shall put upon the corners of the altar which is before the L-rd, which is in the tent of meeting; and all of the blood he shall pour at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tent of meeting.
- 4:19 And all of its fat he shall take off from it and cause it to smoke upon the altar.
- 4:20 And he shall do to the bullock as he did to the bullock of the sin-offering; so shall he do to it. And the priest shall make atonement for them and it shall be forgiven them.

And he shall do to the bullock, etc. - What is the intent of this? [Much of the language seems superfluous] "to the bullock" — this [includes in the afore-mentioned specifications] the bullock of Yom Kippur; "as he did to the bullock" — this [includes in the afore-mentioned specifications] the bullock of the anointed priest; "the sin-offering" — this [includes in the aforementioned specifications] the goats brought for the sin of idol worship. I might think that the goats of the festivals and the goats of the New Moon are also included. For this reason it is written: "so shall he do to it" (Zevachim 39b)."

as he did - What does this come to teach? To duplicate the *mitzvah* of sprinkling, so that if he misses one of the seven, he has done nothing. This apprises me that missing one of the seven is in all places [where the *mitzvah* applies] an invalidating factor. How do I know that the same principle applies where four sprinklings are called for? From: "so shall he do" (*Ibid.* a).⁷³⁻⁷⁵

and the priest shall make atonement - All of the day is valid for confession over the bullock. Why so? It is written here: "atonement," and, in respect to Yom Kippur, "atonement." Just as the atonement of

Yom Kippur is in the day-time, as it is written (*Ibid.* 16:30): "For on this day He will atone for you," so the atonement here is in the day-time (*Megillah* 20b).⁷⁶

and it shall be forgiven them - [What is the intent of: "make atonement" and "shall be forgiven"? (They are seemingly redundant.)] And he shall "make atonement" — even if he has not "placed" [i.e., omission of the second does not invalidate the first]; "and it shall be forgiven" — even if he has omitted the rite of the left-over blood (Zevachim 39a).⁷⁷

4:21 And he shall take the bullock outside the camp, and he shall burn it as he burned the first bullock; it is the sin-offering of the congregation.

the first bullock - What is the intent of this? That it be "first" to the bullock of the congregation, whence it is derived that if the bullock of the anointed priest and the bullock of the congregation are awaiting sacrifice, the bullock of the anointed priest takes precedence (*Horiyoth* 13a). 78

it is the sin-offering of the congregation - "the sin-offering of the congregation" — this is the prototype for all congregational sin-offerings being burned: "it" — to exclude the goats of festivals, which, even though they are congregational sin-offerings, are not burned. Why so? Because they are not offered for the transgression of a particular mitzvah (Torath Cohanim).

4:22 If a leader sin, and he do one of all the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd his G-d, which may not be done, unwittingly, and he be guilty.

If ["asher"] a leader sin - What is intended by "asher"? R. Yochanan b. Zakkai said: Fortunate ["ashrei"] is the generation whose leader brings a sacrifice for his unwitting sins (Horiyoth 10b).⁷⁹

If a leader sin - The Rabbis taught: "If [lit., "that"] a leader sin." I might think that this is a decree! It is, therefore, written (3): "If the

anointed priest shall sin"; just as there the meaning is: if and when he sins; here, too, the meaning is: if and when he sins (*Ibid.* a). 80

If a leader sin - a leader who passed from his station and then sinned is like an ordinary person; for it is written: "If a leader sin" — when he is a leader", and not when he is an ordinary person (Ibid.).81

If a leader sin - to exclude a leader who contracted leprosy, as it is written (II Kings 14:5): "And the L-rd smote the king, and he was a leper until the day of his death, and he dwelt in the house of freedom" [i.e., where he was "free" of his kingship, an ordinary person] (Ibid.). 82

If a leader sin - If he sinned before he was appointed and then was appointed, he is like an ordinary person, for it is written: "If a leader sin" — to exclude his previous sins (*Ibid.*).83

If a leader sin - The Rabbis taught: I might think that a leader of a tribe is hereby intended; it is, therefore, written: "of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd his G-d." In reference to a king it is written (Deuteronomy 17:19): "so that he may learn to fear the L-rd his G-d." Just as there, no one is above him but "the L-rd his G-d," the leader here, too, has no one above him but "the L-rd his G-d." Who is this? A king (Ibid. 11a).84

of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd - It is written here: "and he do one of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd," and, in respect to the populace (13): "and they do one of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd." Just as the populace are liable [to bring a sin-offering] only for a transgression the intentional commission of which is punishable by cutting-off and the unwitting commission by a sin-offering, so a leader is liable only for a transgression the intentional commission of which is punishable by cutting-off and the unwitting commission by a sin-offering (1bid. 8a).85

which may not be done and they are guilty - One who repents [of his unwitting sin] through his [subsequent] knowledge brings an offering for his unwitting sin; one who does not repent through his knowledge does not bring an offering for his unwitting sin — whence it is derived that sacrifices are not accepted from a heretic (*Ibid.*).86

4:23 If his sin become known to him that he has sinned in it, then

he shall bring his offering, a kid of goats, a male without blemish.

If his sin become known to him - The Rabbis taught: "If his sin become known to him" — and not that others apprise him of it. I might think [this applies] even if he does not refute them; it is, therefore, written: "If his sin become known to him" — in any manner (Krituth 11b).87

that he has sinned in it - ["in it"] It must be known to him specifically in what he has sinned (*Ibid.* 19a). 88

4:24 And he shall place his hand upon the head of the goat, and he shall slaughter it in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered before the L-rd; it is a sin-offering.

upon the head of the goat - What is the intent of "the goat"? To include the goat of Nachshon [the leader of a tribe] for "placing" (Menachoth 92b).⁸⁹

and he shall slaughter it - What is the intent of "it"? "It" northward, but the slaughterer need not stand facing northward. The priest who receives the blood, however, must stand in the north [of the altar]. "It" northward, but not the goat of Nachshon northward (Zevachim 48b).90

and he shall slaughter it - "it" and not its substitute, and elsewhere it is written (33): "and he shall slaughter it" — "it" and not its exchange and not its offspring (Torath Cohanim).

in the place where, etc. - "in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered." Where is that? In the north [of the altar] (Zevachim 48b).⁹¹

it is a sin-offering - Concerning a sin-offering it is written "it" with respect to slaughtering, to indicate that if it is slaughtered for that purpose it is fit, but if not, it is unfit (*Ibid.* 10b).⁹²

it is a sin-offering - What is the intent of this? To teach that all that is prescribed in respect to it must be done for the purpose of a sin-offering (*Torath Cohanim*).

4:25 And the priest shall take from the blood of the sin-offering with his finger and put it on the corners of the altar of the burnt-offering, and he shall pour out its blood at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering.

And the priest shall take - And if a monkey came and put it into his hands, he must take it another time (Zevachim 14a).⁹³

And the priest shall take - preceded by: "and he shall slaughter it in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered" — whence we derive that the receiving of the blood of the sin-offering also requires the "north." Whence do we derive that the receiver himself [must stand in the north]? From "velakach" ["and he shall take"] — "lo yikach" ["he shall betake himself"] (Ibid. 45a).94

from the blood of the sin-offering - whence it is derived that he must take it for the purpose of a sin-offering (*Ibid.* 8a). 95

with his finger - The Rabbis taught: "with his finger," "and he shall take" — which teaches us that the taking must be with the right index finger; "with his finger and put" — which teaches us that the putting must be with his right index finger (*Ibid.* 24a). 96

on the corners - [All together, in relation to the "outside" sin-offerings it is written, in the respective sections:] "karnoth" ["corners"], "karnoth," "karnoth" [plene, counting for two], giving a total of four—three for the mitzvah [three "puttings"], and one for the invalidating factor [i.e., there must be at least one "putting" if the offering is to be valid] (Ibid. 37b).97

and he shall pour out its blood - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if the blood of a sin-offering were collected in four goblets, and he performed one "putting" from one and one "putting" from the other, that they must all be poured out at the foundation? From (30): "and all its blood he shall pour out." I might think that if he performed all four "puttings" from one of the goblets they should all be poured out at the foundation. It is, therefore, written: "and he shall pour out its blood." What is done? It is poured out at the foundation and the others are poured into the sewer [in the Temple] (Ibid. 34b). 98

at the foundation of the altar of the burnt-offering - The left-over blood [of the "outside" sin-offerings] was poured out at the southern foundation, it being written: "at the foundation of the altar," this being the southern foundation. But perhaps it is the western foundation! His descent from the ramp is likened to his exit from the sanctuary. Just as in his exit from the sanctuary the side indicated is that nearest him, namely, the western foundation, so in his descent from the ramp, the side indicated is that nearest him, namely, the southern foundation (Yoma 59a).99

4:26 And all of its fat he shall cause to smoke upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.

as the fat of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings - Just as there (*Ibid.* 3:3-4), the fat that is an even layer, membranous, and easily peeled, and the two kidneys, and the lobe — here, too [the same is intended] (*Torath Cohanim*).

and atone - These three "and atone" [in this section] — what is their intent? One, even if he performed only three "puttings"; one, even if he performed only two; one, even if he performed only one (Zevachim 38a). 100,101

and the priest shall make atonement for him - Rava said: If one slaughtered a sin-offering on behalf of one who was obligated to bring a burnt-offering, it is valid. Why so? It is written: "and the priest shall make atonement for him" — for him, and not for his neighbor — his neighbor who is similar to him in that he requires the same type of atonement that he does [i.e., a sin-offering] (Ibid. 7a). 102

and the priest shall make atonement for him - Rav said: If one slaughtered a sin-offering on behalf of a dead person, it is valid. Why so? [It is written: "and the priest shall make atonement for him" (see above)], and there is no atonement for the dead (*Ibid.* 9b). 103

and the priest shall make atonement for him - "for him" - to teach

that two may not be atoned for as one, and that the priest may make atonement for himself (*Torath Cohanim*).

and the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin - that the atonement be for the express purpose of a sin-offering — whence it is derived that the sprinkling [in which the atonement primarily consists] must be for the express purpose of a sin-offering (*Ibid.* 8a). 104

and it shall be forgiven him - It [i.e., the sin] is not "left over" until Yom Kippur (*Torath Cohanim*).

4:27 And if a single soul sin unwittingly, of the people of the land, in doing it, one of the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd which may not be done, and he be guilty,

And if a single soul - An individual is obliged to bring a sin-offering only for a transgression the intentional commission of which is punishable by cutting-off and the unwitting commission by a sin-offering, for it is written: "And if a single soul sin," this instance being compared to the preceding one [of a leader's sinning, in which the same qualification applies] (Horiyoth 8a). 105

a single soul sin - Three singular expressions are written here ["single," "soul," "sin" (singular in the Hebrew)], one to exclude [from a sin-offering] one picking up [an object in one domain on the Sabbath] and another putting it down [in a different domain], one to exclude an instance [on the Sabbath] where each [of the two parties to a forbidden labor] is able to perform [the labor by himself], and one to exclude an individual who sinned unwittingly through a mistaken ruling of beth-din (Shabbath 93a). 106,107

of the people of the land - to exclude a heretic, from whom sacrifices are not accepted (*Horiyoth* 2a). 108

of the people of the land - to exclude an anointed priest, to exclude a leader [from this type of sin-offering] (*Ibid.* 11a).¹⁰⁹

of the people of the land - I might think, since it is written: "a single soul," that only one individual who sinned unwittingly is liable, but not two or three; it is, therefore, written: "of the people of the land" — even

if they are many, even if they are most of the congregation, and even if beth-din brings a bullock because of them [i.e., because of having misled them through an erroneous ruling] (Torath Cohanim).

in doing it - The Rabbis taught: "in doing it" — "it," and not part of it, whence it is derived that if two carried an object into the public domain on the Sabbath, they are exempt [from a sin-offering] (Shabbath 93a). 110

4:28 If his sin became known to him wherein he sinned, then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he has sinned.

If his sin became known - These three "knowings": in respect to an individual: [here], in respect to a leader (23), and in respect to the populace (14) — what is their intent? If they are not needed for themselves [for one could have served as a source for the others], learn them as applying to an instance where the sin became known to him after Yom Kippur [the "knowings" informing us] that he brings a sin-offering [though Yom Kippur atones] (Krituth 26b). 111,112

then he shall bring his offering - If one set aside his sin-offering and died, his son may not bring it [for himself] afterwards, for it is written: "then he shall bring his offering" — he fulfills his obligation with his offering, but not with that of his father (*Ibid.* 27b).¹¹³

his offering ... for his sin - One who set aside his sin-offering for one sin may not bring it for a different sin, for it is written: "then he shall bring his offering ... for his sin" — his offering must be in the name of his sin [for which it was originally set aside] (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁴

for his sin which he has sinned - It was taught: If one [unwittingly] ate two olive-sizes of forbidden fat in one time span, and he was made aware of the first, and then, of the second, R. Yochanan says: He must bring two sin-offerings. Why so? For if it is written: "for his sin" [implying each individual sin], "then he shall bring" (Shabbath 71b)."

a kid f the goats - and in respect to the sin-offering for idol worship it is written (Numbers 15:29): "One law shall there be for you for one who

sins unwittingly"; just as there, a one-year-old goat [is specified], here, too, a one-year-old goat (Torath Cohanim).

4:29 And he shall place his hand on the head of the sin-offering, and he shall slaughter the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering.

in the place of the burnt-offering - And where is the burnt-offering slaughtered? In the north [of the altar], whence it is derived that the sin-offering requires "north". This suffices for the *mitzvah*; whence do I derive the invalidating factor [i.e., that the offering is not valid *unless* it is slaughtered in the north]? From [the repetition (24)]: "and he shall slaughter it in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered" (Zevachim 48a).¹¹⁶

- 4:30 And the priest shall take of its blood with his finger, and he shall put it on the corners of the altar of the burnt-offering, and all its blood he shall pour out at the foundation of the altar.
- 4:31 And all its fat he shall remove, as he removed the fat from the sacrifice of the sin-offerings, and the priest shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, a sweet savor to the L-rd; and the priest shall make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.
- 4:32 And if a lamb he brings as his offering for a sin-offering, a female without blemish shall he bring it.

And if a lamb - R. Shimon says: "Lambs" precede "goats" in all [other] places [in the Torah]. I might think this is so because they are preferred to them; it is, therefore, written here [in reverse order]; "And if a lamb he brings as his offering for a sin-offering" — to teach that they are both equal (Krituth 28a)."

And if a lamb he brings - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one set aside his sin-offering, and it was lost, and he set aside another in its place — after which the first one was found — so that now two are standing before him — whence is it derived that he may bring whichever he wishes? From: "And if a lamb he brings as his offering for a sin-offering." I might think that he brings both! It is, therefore, written: "shall he bring it" — one, and not two (Temurah 15a). [118,119]

4:33 And he shall place his hand upon the head of the sinoffering, and he shall slaughter it as a sin-offering in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered.

and he shall slaughter it as a sin-offering - in the name of that particular sin-offering; but if he slaughtered a sin-offering for [forbidden] fat in the name of a sin-offering for blood, or in the name of any other sin-offering, it is invalid (Zevachim 9b).¹²⁰

- 4:34 And the priest shall take from the blood of the sin-offering with his finger and put it on the corners of the altar of the burnt-offering; and he shall pour out all its blood at the foundation of the altar.
- 4:35 And all its fat he shall remove, as the fat of the lamb is removed from the sacrifice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall cause them to smoke upon the altar, upon the fire-offerings of the L-rd. And the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin which he has sinned, and it shall be forgiven him.
- 5:1 And if a soul sin and hear the voice of a curse, and he is a witness or saw or knew, if he does not tell, then he shall hear his sin

And if a soul sin - It is written here: "if a soul sin," and, in respect to an

oath over a pledge (*Ibid.* 21): "if a soul sin"; just as there, money is claimed and owing, here, too, the instance is one in which money is claimed and owing — to exclude an instance of one's saying: I place you under oath to come and testify that so and so said he would give me two hundred zuz and did not, in which instance, if they denied knowledge of the fact, [and afterwards admitted] that they had lied, they are exempt [from the offering for lying under oath] (*Shevuoth* 35a).

And if a soul sin - The Rabbis taught: In all [cases of an oleh-veyored offering], it is stated: "and it be hidden" [the fact that he has sinned], and here it is not stated "and it be hidden" — to teach that they are liable [to bring the offering for lying under oath] for inadvertency [not knowing that an offering is required in such an instance] just as for knowing violation (Krituth 9a).²

And if a soul sin - Since it is [first] written: "And if a soul sin," and only then: "and hear the voice of a curse," it is to be derived that even if he were not placed under oath there is a sin [for withholding testimony]; it is just that where there is an oath, liability for an offering is incurred (Sheiltoth deRav Achai Gaon).

and hear - in any language which is heard — whence it is derived that the oath to the witnesses may be administered in any language (Sotah 33a).

and hear - to exclude one who is deaf [from the offering] (Tosefta Shevuoth 3).5

and hear, etc. - The Rabbis taught: If he imposed upon them the oath: When you are apprised of testimony on my behalf, swear to me that you will come and testify for me — I might think that they are liable [if they do not testify]; it is, therefore, written: "and hear the voice of a curse, and he is a witness or saw or knew" — one whose [apprisal of] testimony preceded his oath, and not one whose oath preceded his testimony (Shevuoth 35a).6

and hear - This implies only an oath administered by others. Whence do I derive that an oath taken by oneself [makes one subject to the offering]? I induce it. It is written here: "soul," and, in respect to an oath over a pledge (*Ibid.* 21): "soul." Just as an oath over a pledge

obtains whether administered by others or taken by oneself, so the oath to witnesses obtains whether administered by others or taken by oneself (Yerushalmi Shevuoth 5:1).⁷

and hear the voice of a curse - A curse is accompanied by an oath, as it is written (Numbers 5:21): "Then the priest shall make the woman swear with the oath of the curse." Whence do I derive that a curse without an oath is accounted as a curse with an oath, and an oath without a curse as an oath with a curse? From: "And hear the voice of a curse" — "and hear the voice [oath]," "and hear the curse" (Shevuoth 35b).8

and he is a witness - The Rabbis taught: If he saw a party of men, and his witnesses among them, and he said to them: "I charge you with an oath, if you can testify on my behalf, that you come and testify," I might think that they are liable; I am, therefore, told: "and he is a witness" — but in this case, he did not designate his witnesses. I might think that this applies even if he said: "All who are standing here"; I am, therefore, told: "and he is a witness" — [by so saying] he has designated his witnesses (*Ibid.* a). 9,10

and he is a witness - Is the verse speaking of two witnesses or of one alone? It is written (*Deuteronomy* 19:15): "One witness shall not stand up against a man." Does not "witness" tell me that he is "one"? What, then, is the purpose of "one"? This is a prototype [for all such instances]. Wherever "witness" is written, two are understood, unless "one" is explicitly stated (*Sanhedrin* 30a).¹¹

and he is a witness - It was taught: If one witness were told: "To us you have the acceptability of two witnesses," I might think he would be liable; it is, therefore, written: "and he is a witness" — only he who satisfies the Torah criterion of "witness," to exclude a single witness, who does not satisfy that criterion (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 3:9)¹²

or saw - It was taught: If he could testify on his behalf before he became his son-in-law, and then he became his son-in-law, and then his daughter died, he is acceptable as a witness. This is the criterion: All whose beginning and end [in respect to testimony] are acceptable, are acceptable [as witnesses, even though they are disqualified in the interim], as it is written: "or saw ... if he does not tell"; the Torah made

seeing and telling the determinants of testimony, and these obtain [acceptably] in this instance (*Erchin* 18a).¹³

or saw or knew - It was taught: R. Yehoshua b. Karchah said: Witnesses who saw what they testify about, even one after the other, combine [to constitute the acceptable two witnesses]; for it is written: "or saw or knew" — in any manner (Sanhedrin 30a).14

or saw or knew - It was taught: R. Yossi Haglili said: Whence is it derived that the verse is speaking only of a monetary claim? It is written: "and he is a witness or saw or knew." The verse is speaking of testimony that can consist in seeing without knowing or in knowing without seeing. How so? [If one says] "I counted out a maneh for you in the presence of so and so" [and the other replies] "Let them come and testify" [and I will pay it to you] — this is seeing without knowing [whether the money was given as a gift or as a loan]. "You admitted owing me a maneh in the presence of so and so." "Let them come and testify" — this is knowing [the indebtedness] without seeing [the actual transaction] (Shevuoth 33b). 15-17

or saw or knew - "or saw" — to exclude a blind man; "or knew" — to exclude an ignoramus (*Tosefta Shevuoth* 3). 18,19

if he does not tell - one who is qualified to "tell" — to exclude a gambler. Even though his disqualification is only rabbinical [and not Torah-based], still he is not considered a "teller" [and is, therefore, not liable for the offering] (Yoma 74a).²⁰

if he does not tell - to exclude a mute, who is unable to tell [he is, accordingly, not permitted to testify by writing] (Gittin 71a).²¹

if he does not tell - Once he testifies [on a certain matter], he may not return and testify [differently], for, in respect to testimony, only one "telling" is indicated — "if he does not tell" (Kethuvoth 18b and Rashi).²²

if he does not tell - It was taught: R. Natan says: The testimony of one witness [on a certain matter] is heard on one day, and when the co-witness comes the next day, his testimony is heard [this satisfying the requirement of two witnesses], for it is written: "if he does not tell," and telling is likened to seeing [i.e., just as non-concurrent observations

are combined into one (see above), so non-concurrent testimonies] (Sanhedrin 30b).²³

if he does not tell - The Rabbis taught: If one sent his servant [to make his claim], or if the claimee said to them: "I charge you under oath that if you can testify on his [the claimant's] behalf, you must come and do so"—I might think they are liable; it is, therefore, written: "if he does not [Heb., a combination of "him" and "not"] tell, then he shall bear his sin"— if he does not tell him [the claimant], then he shall bear his sin; but if he does not tell another, he is not liable (Shevuoth 35a).²⁴

if he does not tell - The Rabbis taught: If one said to two men: "I charge you under oath that if you can testify on my behalf you must come and do so," and they had heard others testify on his behalf [but had no "direct" testimony], or if one of them was a near relation of his or [generally] unfit to testify — I might think they would be liable: it is, therefore, written: "if he does not tell" — the verse is speaking of those who are fit to tell (*Ibid.*).25

if he does not tell - The Rabbis taught: The oath to witnesses is administered to those who are fit [to testify], and not to those who are unfit, for it is written: "if he does not tell, then he shall bear his sin"—one who by his telling causes his neighbor to pay, to exclude one, who is unfit, who, even if he does tell, does not cause his neighbor to pay (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 3:9).²⁶

then he shall bear his sin - under the laws of Heaven, but he is exempt from the laws of man (Bava Kamma 57a).²⁷

then he shall bear his sin - It was taught: How are the witnesses frightened [so that they do not deviate from the truth] in capital cases? They are told: "Lest you utter conjecture or hearsay, let it be known to you that his blood and the blood of his seed are on your heads to the end of the generations. And lest you say: [If so,] why get involved in all this [by testifying altogether] — has it not already been said: 'if he does not tell, then he shall bear his sin'?" (Sanhedrin 37b).²⁸

then he shall bear his sin - If he charged them with the oath outside of beth-din, they are not liable. Why so? It is written: "if he does not tell, then he shall bear his sin" — liability obtains only where his telling would oblige the other to pay (Sehvuoth 32a).²⁹

5:2 Or if a soul touch any unclean thing, or the carcass of an unclean animal, or the carcass of an unclean beast, or the carcass of an unclean creeping thing, and it be hidden from him, and he is unclean, and he is guilty.

the carcass of an unclean animal - This informs me of the unclean; whence do I derive the clean [as subsumed in this stricture]? It is written: "or the carcass of an unclean creeping thing." Now is there "unclean" and "clean" in respect to a creeping thing? [Are they not all unclean?] But [we are thus apprised] that just as with creeping things no distinction is made between clean and unclean, so with beasts and animals no distinction is to be made between clean and unclean [as far as the carcass is concerned] (Tosefta Shevuoth 1).30

an unclean animal - What are we taught by this "unclean"? To include [in the stricture] even touching an olive-size of it. What are we taught by the "unclean" of "beast"? To include the horn and the hairs that are attached to the flesh. What are we taught by the "unclean" of "creeping things"? To include the combining of admixtures of their blood [into prohibited quantities] (Torath Cohanim).

or the carcass of an unclean beast - It was taught: Rebbi said: If I read "animal," why is "beast" stated ["beast" being included in the category of "animal"]? It is written here: "beast," and elsewhere (*Ibid.* 7:21): "an unclean beast"; just as there, the subject is the defiling of what is sanctified, here, too, this is the subject (*Shevuoth* 7a). 31,32

the carcass of an unclean beast - just as the carcass of a beast, which is a primary source of uncleanliness — to exclude the touching of unclean foods, liquids, or shards, which are not primary sources of uncleanliness (Torath Cohanim).

5:3 Or if he touch the uncleanness of a man, for all his uncleanness in which he becomes unclean, and it be hidden from him, and he knew, and he is guilty.

Or if he touch - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that the verse is speaking only of the defiling of the sanctuary and of sanctified objects? It is induced. Since Scripture exhorts against and punishes for

uncleanliness and imposes an offering for uncleanliness, just as its exhortation and punishment is for the defiling of the sanctuary and of sanctified objects, so its imposition of an offering is for the defiling of the sanctuary and of sanctified objects (*Shevuoth* 6b).^{33,34}

with the uncleanness of a man - "a man" — this is the dead person himself; "with the uncleanness of a man" — this is one who has come in contact with a body; "for all his uncleanliness in which he becomes unclean" — to include one who cohabited with a niddah (Torath Cohanim).

in which he becomes unclean - [lit., "which he becomes unclean in it"] What is the intent of "it"? To include the carcass of a clean bird (Shevuoth 7b).³⁵

and it be hidden from him - Why is "and it be hidden" mentioned twice? [here and in verse 2]? To make one liable for "hiddenness" [non-awareness] of uncleanness and for "hiddenness" of [being in] the sanctuary (*Ibid.* 14b).³⁶

and he knew - It was taught: Whence is it derived that he is not liable unless there is awareness in the beginning, awareness in the end, and non-awareness in the middle? From: "and it be hidden to him" — the implication [in the Hebrew] being that it was known to him before; "and he knew" at the end — there thus being two "knowings" (*Ibid.* 4b).³⁷

5:4 Or if a soul swear, to pronounce with the lips, to do ill or to do good, for all that a man will pronounce with an oath, and it be hidden from him, and he knew, and he is guilty in one of these,

Or if a soul swear - I might think that one who broke a Naziritic vow or a vow to bring an offering would be liable to bring this offering; it is, therefore, written: "if a soul swear" — he is liable for swearing, but not for a Naziritic vow or a vow to bring an offering (Torath Cohanim).

to pronounce with the lips - The Rabbis taught: "Mevatai"

["pronounce"] designates an oath, for it is written: "Or if a soul swear, to pronounce with the lips" (Shevuoth 20a). 38

to pronounce with the lips - The Rabbis taught: I might think, since it is written: "to do ill or to do good," that only things [oaths] tending to some good or evil are herein subsumed. Whence do I derive the inclusion of things which do not tend to good or evil? From: "to pronounce with the lips" [implying anything that is pronounced] (*Ibid.* 26a).³⁹

to pronounce with the lips - Shmuel said: One who resolved something in his heart must utter it [as an oath] with his lips [to be liable for the offering], as it is written: "to pronounce with the lips" (*Ibid.* b).⁴⁰

to pronounce with the lips - And not if he resolved in his heart to utter: "a wheat loaf," but uttered: "a barley loaf" (Ibid.).41

to do ill or to do good - The Rabbis said: I might think that if one swore to do ill to himself but did not, he is exempt [from the offering]; it is, therefore, written: "to do ill or to do good." Just as doing good is one's option, so doing ill [in this context] is one's option — so that I include [for liability] one who swore to do ill to himself, but did not do so, the option having existed for him (*Ibid.* 27a). 42,43

to do ill or to do good - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if one swore to do ill to others but did not, he is liable; it is, therefore, written: "to do ill or to do good." Just as doing good is one's option, so doing ill [in this context] is one's option — so that I exclude one who swore to do ill to others, but did not do so, the option not having existed for him (*Ibid.*).⁴⁴

to do ill or to do good - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if one swore to fulfill a mitzvah but did not fulfill it, he is liable [for the offering]; it is, therefore, written: "to do ill or to do good." Just as doing ill [in this context] is one's option, so doing good [in this context] is one's option — so that I exclude one who swore to fulfill a mitzvah, but did not do so [the option of not fulfilling it not having existed for him] (Ibid.).45

to do ill or to do good - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if one swore to violate a mitzvah but did not do so, he is liable; it is, therefore,

written: "to do ill or to do good." Just as doing good is an option, so doing ill [in this context] is an option — so that I exclude one who swore to violate a mitzvah but did not do so [the option of violating it not having existed for him] (Ibid.).46

or to do good - to include doing good to others [one being liable if he breaks such an oath] (*Ibid.*).⁴⁷

for all that a man will pronounce - The Rabbis taught: I might think, since it is written: "to pronounce with the lips" that only the future is intended. Whence do I derive that [swearing falsely about what has taken place in] the past is also included? From: "for all that a man will pronounce" (Ibid. 26a).48

for all that a man will pronounce - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one resolved in his heart to utter: "a wheat loaf," but he uttered [merely]: "a loaf," he is liable? From: "for all that a man will pronounce" (*Ibid.* b).⁴⁹

a man will pronounce with an oath - [Heb., "... a man with an oath"] — this excludes one who is prevented [from fulfilling his oath, "man" implying the ability to perform] (*Ibid.* a).⁵⁰

and it be hidden from him - The Rabbis taught: "and it be hidden from him" — to exclude deliberate [non-fulfillment of the oath]; "from him" — the oath being hidden from [i.e., forgotten by] him. I might think that it is the object [which he forswore] that was hidden from him; it is, therefore, written: "with an oath, and it be hidden" — he is liable when the oath is hidden but not when the object is hidden (*Ibid.* 27a). 51,52

5:5 And it shall be, if he be guilty for one of these, then he shall confess wherein he has sinned.

for one of these - He is held liable for each one alone, but not for two [This teaches us that he is not held liable for the oath to witnesses and the oath of "pronouncement" at the same time] (*Ibid.* 25b).⁵³

for one of these - If he administered the oath five times, and they denied

it [each time], they are liable for each one, as it is written: "for one of these" — implying liability for each one (*Ibid.* 32a).⁵⁴

for one of these - There are among these that for which he is liable and that for which he is exempt. How so? If money is claimed, he is liable [for swearing falsely that he could not testify]; if anything else is claimed, he is exempt (*Ibid.* 33b).⁵⁵

for one of these - I might think that for defiling the sanctuary and sanctified objects he is liable for only one [offering]; or that for all the defilements of the sanctuary and all the defilements of sanctified objects, he is liable for only one [offering]; it is, therefore, written: "of these" — to indicate liability for each one [i.e., for each act of defilement] (Torath Cohanim).

then he shall confess - It was taught: If one witness said to him: "You were unclean," and he said: "I was not unclean," he is exempt [from the offering], for it is written: "then he shall confess"; if he confesses to these things, he is liable; if not, he is exempt (Krituth 12a). 56

then he shall confess - This teaches us that he requires confession. And just as the confession of Yom Kippur is over a living animal, the confession here, too, is over a living animal (*Torath Cohanim*). 56*

5:6 And he shall bring his guilt-offering to the L-rd for his sin which he has sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb, or a she-kid from the goats, for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make atonement for him from his sin.

for his sin - If he took an oath that he would not eat and he ate many foods; if he would not drink, and he drank many beverages; that he would not eat, and he ate and drank — whence do I derive that he is liable for only one [offering]? From: "one ... for his sin" (Torath Cohanim).

from the flock, a lamb, etc. - [Don't I know that a lamb and a goat are from the flock? Why must I be told: "from the flock"?] To include all that "flock" implies, even the deaf, the disoriented, and the dwarfish, and to exclude the pallax [intermediate between lamb and ram] (*Ibid.*).

for his sin [lit., "from his sin"] - The Rabbis taught: It is written here: "from his sin"; in respect to the turtle-doves and the pigeons (10): "from his sin"; and, in respect to the tenth of the ephah (13): "on his sin" — to teach that, in what is sanctified: "from" a lamb, a goat may be brought; from a goat, a lamb may be brought; from a lamb and a goat, turtle-doves and young pigeons; and from turtle-doves and young pigeons, a tenth of an ephah [so that if he lacks the means, he deducts "from" the value of the offering]. Similarly, if he grew wealthier, he brings from the tenth of an ephah turtle-doves and young pigeons, and from turtle-doves and young pigeons, a lamb or a goat [so that if he has the means, he adds "on" to the value of the offering] (Krituth 27b).

5:7 And if his hand cannot attain enough for a lamb, then he shall bring his guilt-offering wherein he has sinned, two turtle-doves or two young pigeons to the L-rd, one for a sin-offering and one for a burnt-offering.

And if his hand cannot attain - This teaches us that he is not told to borrow and not to engage in his occupation (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵⁸

enough for a lamb - Whence is it derived that if he has enough [for a lamb], but could not supply his needs [if he made that expenditure], he brings the offering of the poor man? From: "enough for a lamb" [the implication being that offering a lamb would leave him with enough] (*Ibid.*).⁵⁹

5:8 And he shall bring them to the priest, and he shall sacrifice the one for the sin-offering first; and he shall pinch its head opposite its nape, but not sunder it.

And he shall bring them - "them" — themselves, whence it is derived that a bird cannot be redeemed; "to the priest" — whence it is derived that the burden of getting them to the priest is his (Ibid.).

the one for the sin-offering first - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall sacrifice the one for the sin-offering first": What are we taught hereby? If that the sin-offering is sacrificed first, this is explicitly stated (10): "And the second one he shall make a burnt-offering." Rather, this is a

prototype for all sin-offerings, that they precede the burnt-offerings that accompany them, even a sin-offering of a bird preceding a burnt-offering of a beast (Zevachim 90b).⁶⁰

And he shall pinch its head - It was taught: R. Eliezer said: I might think that just as the pinching of a bird is opposite the nape; [see below], so the slaughtering of a beast is opposite the nape; it is, therefore, written: "and he shall pinch its head opposite its nape" — the head of this [a bird] opposite the nape, but not the head of another [a beast] opposite the nape (Chullin 27b).61

opposite its nape - The Rabbis taught: "opposite its nape" — opposite the beholder of the nape, as it is written (Numbers 22:5): "and they dwell opposite me," and (Jeremiah 2:27): "for they have turned their nape to me and not their face" — whence it is derived that the entire nape is acceptable for pinching (Ibid. 19b). 62,63

but not sunder it - If he did sunder it, it is unfit (Torath Cohanim).

5:9 And he shall sprinkle from the blood of the sin-offering upon the wall of the altar, and what is left of the blood he shall drain out at the foundation of the altar; it is a sin-offering.

And he shall sprinkle - A woman's sprinkling is invalid. Why so? It is derived a fortiori from the young of the flock, viz.: Now, if with the young of the flock, where a priest was not stipulated for its slaughtering, a priest was stipulated for its sprinkling — with the young of birds, where a priest was stipulated for its pinching, how much more so should a priest be stipulated for its sprinkling! (Kiddushin 36b). 64,65

and he shall sprinkle from the blood of the sin-offering - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall sprinkle from the blood of the sin-offering" — from the body of the sin-offering [and not from a vessel]. How so? He holds on to the head and to the body and sprinkles (Zevachim 64b).66

upon the wall of the altar - "upon the wall of the altar," and not upon the wall of the ramp, and not upon the wall of the heichal [the hall

containing the altar], and not upon the wall of the *ulam* [the hall leading to the Temple] (*Ibid.*).⁶⁷

upon the wall of the altar - Upon which wall? The bottom wall. Perhaps it is the top wall that is intended? [This is not so, for] it is written: "and what is left of the blood he shall drain out at the foundation of the altar" — the wall from which the left-overs are drained to the foundation. Which is this? The bottom wall (*Ibid.*).68,69

it is a sin-offering - This ["it"] teaches us that the draining of the blood of the sin-offering of a bird is an invalidating factor [i.e., failure to do so invalidates the offering] $(Me'ilah\ 8b)$.

5:10 And the second one he shall make a burnt-offering as prescribed, and the priest shall make atonement for him from his sin which he has sinned, and it shall be forgiven him.

he shall make a burnt-offering as prescribed - What is the intent of "as prescribed"? As prescribed for the sin-offering of a bird. Just as the sin-offering of a bird is pinched opposite its nape, so the burnt-offering of a bird is pinched opposite its nape (Chullin 21b).⁷¹

5:11 And if his hand does not attain to two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, then he shall bring his offering wherein he has sinned, a tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering; he shall not place oil upon it and he shall not put frankincense upon it, for it is a sin-offering.

then he shall bring - It was taught: R. Yehudah says: Beloved is a *mitzvah* in its time, for he brings it [i.e., even a "poor man's offering"] immediately and does not wait to become wealthier so that he may bring a lamb or a goat (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷²

for a sin-offering - [But are we not speaking of a sin-offering? Why, then, say: "for a sin-offering"?] That he put aside money specifically for a sin-offering (*Ibid.*).

he shall not place oil upon it - R. Yitzchak b. Yosef said in the name of R. Yochanan: If one put any amount of oil upon an olive-size of meal-offering, it is invalid. Why so? For it is written: "he shall not place," and "placing" implies any amount [The meal-offering itself, however, must be at least olive-size (to be so invalidated). Why so? For it is written:] "upon it" — implying the specified quantity (Menachoth 19b). 73

he shall not place oil upon it - If he places oil on the left-over of the meal-offering, he does not transgress a negative commandment [for the verse states: "he shall not place oil upon it" — the meal-offering itself is being referred to] (*Ibid.* 60a).⁷⁴

he shall not place ... and he shall not put - The Rabbis taught: "he shall not place oil upon it and he shall not put frankincense upon it." I might think that two priests are being referred to; it is, therefore, written: "upon it" — the meal-offering itself is being referred to and not the priest (*Ibid.*).75

and he shall not place ... and he shall not put - The Rabbis taught: "he shall not place oil upon it and he shall not put frankincense upon it." I might think he should not place a vessel [containing oil or frankincense] upon the vessel [containing the meal-offering]; it is, therefore, written: "upon it" — the meal-offering itself is being referred to (Ibid.). 16

and he shall not put frankincense upon it - R. Yitzchak b. Yosef said in the name of R. Yochanan: If one put an olive-size of frankincense upon any amount of meal-offering, it is invalidated. Why so? For it is written: "he shall not put" — there must be "putting" [which is elsewhere derived to be an olive-size]; "upon it" is an additive clause, and "addition follows addition [the "upon it" of oil] only for exclusion" [i.e., to exclude the meal-offering in respect to frankincense from the olive-size requirement] (Ibid. 59b)."

for it is a sin-offering - A sin-offering is called a meal-offering and a meal-offering is called a sin-offering. A meal-offering is being likened to a sin-offering, and a sin-offering to a meal-offering. Just as a sin-offering is invalid unless expressly designated as such, so a meal-offering is invalid unless expressly designated as such; and just as a meal-offering

must be sacrificed in the south-western corner of the altar, so a sinoffering must be sacrificed in the south-western corner (Zevachim 63b).^{78,79}

for it is a sin-offering - All meal-offerings whose fistfuls were not taken for the express purpose of the offering are valid; the owners, however, do not fulfill their obligations thereby — except for the meal-offering of "the sinner" [so-called because of the phrase: "for it is a sin-offering"], which is invalid. Why so? For it is written: "for it is a sin-offering" [implying express designation as such] (Menachoth 4a).80

for it is a sin-offering - The Rabbis taught: "he shall not place oil upon it," and if he did, it is invalid. I might think "he shall not put frankincense upon it," and if he did, it is invalid; it is, therefore, written: "for a sin-offering" [i.e., it remains a sin-offering even if frankincense is put upon it]. I might think the same applies to oil; it is therefore, written: "it" [i.e., "it," the frankincense does not invalidate the offering, but the oil does] (Ibid. 59b).

for it is a sin-offering - "It" is called a sin-offering, but another meal-offering is not called a sin-offering. This teaches us that the tenth of an ephah of the high priest [which he offers up every day] is not called a sin-offering. It, therefore, requires frankincense, and its surplus [i.e., any monies left over from its purchase] must "rot" [i.e., remain unused] (Ibid. 108a).82

- 5:12 And he shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take a fistful from it, his entire fistful, as its remembrance; and he shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, upon the fire-offerings of the L-rd; it is a sin-offering.
- 5:13 And the priest shall make atonement for him, for his sin that he has sinned, of one of these, and it shall be forgiven him, and it shall be to the priest as a meal-offering.

And it shall be to the priest as a meal-offering - His [the priest's] mandated offering is being likened to his voluntary offering. Just as his

voluntary offering is not eaten [but completely burned], so his mandated offering is not eaten (*Ibid.* 73b).⁸³

And it shall be to the priest as a meal-offering - "as a meal-offering"
— the priest being permitted to officiate over his own offering (*Ibid.*).84

- 5:14 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 5:15 If a soul profanes, and sins unwittingly, in the sanctified things of the L-rd, then he shall bring his guilt-offering to the L-rd, a ram without blemish, according to your valuation, shekels of silver, according to the shekel of the sanctuary, for a guilt-offering.

a soul - The Rabbis taught: Both the ordinary individual, and the leader, and the anointed priest are included in the law against profanation (Me'ilah 18a).⁸⁵

If a soul profanes - "Profanes" ["ma'al"] connotes a change [from a higher to a lower state], as it is written (Numbers 5:12): "If a man's wife go astray and profane him [uma'alah]," and (I Chronicles 5:25): "And they profaned [vayimalu] the G-d of their fathers, and went astray after the gods of the peoples of the land" (Ibid.).86

If a soul profanes - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that his eating [of sanctified food] and the eating of his neighbor, his [derivation of] benefit and that of his neighbor, his benefit and the eating of his neighbor, his eating and the benefit of his neighbor, combine [to form the minimal prohibited amount, e.g., in an instance where he took the amount of a perutah from the sanctuary and divided it among himself and his neighbor], and even [if the other half were not used] for an extended period of time? From [in the Hebrew]: "profane, profane" — in any manner (Ibid. b).87

If a soul profanes - [Heb., "profane, profane"] — to include even misappropriation from the sanctified [i.e., one order of sanctity] to [a different order of] the sanctified (*Ibid.* 19a).⁸⁸

and sins unwittingly - The sanctified objects of the gentiles are not subject to profanation. Why so? For it is written: "If a soul profanes, and sins unwittingly" — we derive "sin"-"sin" from terumah, in respect to which it is written (Ibid. 22:15): ["And they shall not desecrate the holy things of] the children of Israel" (Temurah 3a).89

and sins unwittingly - It is written here: "sin," and, in respect to terumah (Ibid. 22:9): "and they shall not bear sin because of it [eating of terumah]" — Just as with the sin in respect to terumah, there is damage and benefit, and he who damages benefits, and the object damaged provides the benefit, and the damage and the benefit are simultaneous, and the object in question is not attached to the ground, and the sender of a messenger [to desecrate is regarded as having desecrated himself] — so with the sin of profanation [all of the above apply] (Mei'lah 18b). 90-92

in the sanctified things of the L-rd - to include a burnt-offering, whose skin belongs to the priest, in the injunction against profanation, and to include sanctified objects for Temple maintenance in the injunction against profantion (*Torath Cohanim*).⁹³

in the sanctified things of the L-rd - Whence is it to be derived that if one dedicated to the altar something which is appropriate for the maintenance of the Temple; or to the maintenance of the Temple, something which is appropriate for the altar; or to either of them, things which are appropriate for neither of them, such as brine, vinegar, fish, or grasshoppers — whence is it derived that they are subject to profanation? From: "in the sanctified things of the L-rd" (*Ibid.*).94

in the sanctified things of the L-rd - which are exclusively for the L-rd — to exclude lower-order sanctities, which are not exclusively for the L-rd [but partially permitted to priests and owners] (*Ibid.*).⁹⁵

then he shall bring his guilt-offering - even after Yom Kippur [Yom Kippur not sufficing for atonement] (*Ibid.*).96

according to the shekel of the sanctuary - and not Babylonian, Median, or Cappadocian shekels (*Ibid.*).

5:16 And what he has sinned in the sanctified things, he shall

pay, and its fifth he shall add to it, and he shall give it to the priest; and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the guilt-offering, and it shall be forgiven him.

And what he has sinned - to include in the obligation of restitution the value of less than half of a *perutah* [unlike the case with non-sanctified objects, where only the value of a *perutah* or more must be returned] (Bava Metzia 55a).⁹⁷

in the sanctified things he shall pay - To that specific order of sanctified things which he has profaned he shall make restitution (*Torath Cohanim*). 98

and its fifth he shall add to it - so that it and its fifth equal five [i.e., if the value is four, he shall not take one-fifth of that, but add an additional part] (Bava Metzia 54a).⁹⁹

and the priest - This teaches us that the priest, too, is subject to the laws of profanation, [the sanctified objects being G-d's and not his] (*Torath Cohanim*). 100

with the ram of the guilt-offering - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if he brought [the value of] his profanation, but not his offering, or his offering, but not his profanation, that he has not satisfied the requirement? From: "with the ram [the offering] of the guilt-offering [the value of the profanation], and it shall be forgiven him" (Bava Kamma 111a). 101

with the ram of the guilt-offering - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if he brings his offering before he brings [the value of] his profanation he has not satisfied his requirement? From: "with the ram of the guilt-offering" — the guilt-offering [the value of the profanation] having already been brought (*Ibid.*).¹⁰²

with the ram of the guilt-offering - The Rabbis taught: I might think that just as [omission of] the ram and of compensation for profanation are invalidating factors, so [omission of] the additional fifth is an invalidating factor; it is, therefore, written: "with the ram of the guilt-offering, and it shall be forgiven him" — the ram and the guilt-offering

[the value of the profanation] are invalidating factors, but not the additional fifth (Bava Kamma 101a). 103

5:17 And if a soul sin and do one of all the *mitzvoth* of the L-rd which may not be done, and not know, and be guilty, then he shall bear his transgression.

And if a soul - The "And" is in addition to the preceding subject, so that what follows [i.e., a suspended guilt-offering (where there is doubt of one's having sinned)] is derived from what precedes [i.e., the guilt-offering of profanation], to set the value of the suspended guilt-offering at two silver shekels [as specified in the guilt-offering of profanation] (Krituth 22b). 104

of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If there were two pieces in front of him, one of forbidden fat and one of permitted fat, and he ate one of them and does not remember which, he is liable [to bring a suspended guilt-offering]; if there were one piece, concerning which there was a doubt as to whether it was forbidden or permitted fat, and he ate it, he is exempt. Why so? The verse reads: "and he do one of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd" — [Though it is written as "mitzvoth" (singular),] it is read as "mitzvoth" (plural) [implying one of two] (Ibid. 17b). 105

of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd - One who is in doubt as to the profanation of sanctified objects is exempt from a suspended guilt-offering. Why so? It is written here [in respect to a suspended guilt-offering]: "of all the mitzvoth of the L-rd," and, in relation to a sin-offering (Ibid. 4:27): "one of the mitzvoth of the L-rd." Just as there, there is liability only for that, intentional commission of which is punishable by cutting-off, and unwitting commission by a sin-offering, here, too, there is liability only for that, intentional commission of which is punishable by cutting-off, and unintentional commission by a sin-offering — to exclude profanation of sanctified objects, where the combination of intentional commission being punishable by cutting-off and unintentional commission by a sin-offering is lacking [the latter not being subject to a sin-offering, but a guilt-offering of profanation] (Ibid. 22b). 106,107

and not know - If there were before him forbidden fat and nothar [portions of overdue sacrifices, which may not be eaten], and he ate one [piece] of them, and he does not know which, he is exempt [not only from a definite sin-offering, but] even from a suspended guilt-offering; for it is written: "And if a soul sin ... and not know" — to exclude an instance such as this, where he did know [that there would be some sin] and sinned [nevertheless] (Ibid. 19b). 108

and not know and be guilty - When R. Akiva would come to this verse, he would cry, saying: Now if in respect to one who intended to eat permitted fat but happened to come up with forbidden fat, the Torah writes: "and not know ... then he shall bear his transgression," how much more so, one who intended to eat forbidden fat and ate forbidden fat! (Kiddushin 81b). 109

and not know and be guilty - It was taught: Issi b. Yehudah said: "and not know and be guilty" — "For this, all the repiners will repine!" (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁰

and be guilty - A suspended sin-offering is not brought for transgression of a positive and negative commandment relating to [defiling of] the sanctuary. Why so? It is written here: "and be guilty," and, in respect to [an unwitting sin of] the congregation (*Ibid.* 4:13): "and they are guilty"; just as [the sin in respect to] the congregation is that which is subject to a standard sin-offering, so a suspended sin-offering is brought only for possible transgression of that which [if committed unwittingly] is subject to a standard sin-offering [as opposed to unwitting transgression of the *mitzvoth* relating to defilement of the sanctuary, which is subject to an *oleh veyored* ("sliding scale") offering (see 5:2)] (Horiyoth 8b).^{111,112}

5:18 And he shall bring a ram without blemish, from the flock, according to your valuation for a guilt-offering, to the priest; and the priest shall make atonement for him for his unwitting sin which he committed, and he did not know, and it shall be forgiven him.

And he shall bring a ram - "a ram" — a sturdy one, a two-year-old (Torath Cohanim).

for his unwitting sin - It was taught: "and the priest shall make atonement for him for his unwitting sin which he committed" — one whose sin and unwittingness are the same [i.e., both of them pertaining to the deed], to exclude the anointed priest, whose sin and unwittingness are not the same [the firt pertaining to the law itself (i.e., ignorance of the law), and the second to the deed], so that the anointed priest does not bring a suspended guilt-offering (*Horiyoth* 4a).¹¹³

and he did not know, and it shall be forgiven him - It was taught: If one brought a suspended guilt-offering, and it became known to him that he did not sin — if the blood has already been sprinkled, the flesh may be eaten [the offering being regarded as valid]. But why so, if it became known to him? [Isn't the offering invalid in that event, and shouldn't the flesh be burned]? Rava answered: It is written: "and he did not know and it shall be forgiven him," and he did not know at the time of forgiveness [i.e., when the blood was sprinkled] (Krituth 24b).114

5:19 It is a guilt-offering; a guilt-offering to the L-rd.

It is a guilt-offering - R. Huna said: A guilt-offering that had been given over to pasture [as is the law for a guilt-offering whose owner had died or which had been lost and then found after the owner had used another for his atonement, the animal grazing until it contracts some blemish, after which it is sold and its monies used for communal gift-offerings] — a guilt-offering that had been given over to pasture and was slaughtered as a burnt-offering is valid; but if it had not been given over, it is not valid. Why so? For it is written: "It is a guilt-offering" — it remains in its state [of guilt-offering until it is given over] (Zevachim 5b). 115

a guilt-offering, a guilt-offering to the L-rd. This homily was adduced by Yehoyada the priest: "It is a guilt-offering; a guilt-offering, a guilt-offering to the L-rd" — All [monies] that had come [as surplus from expenditures] for a sin-offering or a guilt-offering should be used for purchasing burnt-offerings, the flesh of which goes to the L-rd ["a guilt-offering to the L-rd"], and the skin of which goes to the priests ["a guilt-offering" (to the priests)] (Shekalim 6:6).¹¹⁶

- 5:20 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 5:21 If a soul sin, and commit a profanation against the L-rd, and deny to his neighbor a pledge, or a loan, or a theft, or if he oppress his neighbor,

If a soul sin - It was taught: It is written here: "If a soul sin," and, in respect to the oath of witnesses (1): "If a soul sin"; just as the oath of witnesses is stated in any language, so the oath of a pledge is stated in any language (Sotah 33a).¹¹⁷

If a soul sin - It was taught: It is written here: "If a soul sin," and, in respect to the oath of witnesses (1): "If a soul sin"; just as in the oath of witnesses there is liability [to bring an offering] for inadvertency [not knowing that an offering is required] as for knowing violation — in the oath of a pledge, too, there is liability for inadvertency as for knowing violation (Krituth 9a).¹¹⁸

If a soul sin - It was taught: It is written here: "If a soul sin," and, in respect to the oath of witnesses (1): "If a soul sin"; just as in the oath of witnesses there is liability [to bring an offering] whether there is an oath or a curse, so in the oath of a pledge there is liability whether there is an oath or a curse (Yerushalmi Sheyuoth 5:1)."

and commit a profanation against the L-rd - What is the intent of "against the L-rd"? To include lower order sanctities [portions of which] are the property of the owners. These are the words of R. Yossi Haglili. This applies only so long as the animals are alive, but once they have been slaughtered, the owners acquire [their portions] from "the table of the L-rd" [so that denial of the latter is not subject to liability for an offering, the denial being only to "the L-rd," and not to "his neighbor"] (Kiddushin 52b). 120

and commit a profanation against the L-rd - It was taught: R. Akiva says: What is the intent of "against the L-rd"? Because the depositor deposits the pledge without a receipt and without witnesses, no one knowing about the transaction except the Holy One Bessed be He; therefore, when he denies it, he denies it to "the One who knows." For

this reason it is written: "and commit a profanation against the L-rd" (Torath Cohanim). 121

a profanation against the L-rd and deny to his neighbor - A Tanna taught in the presence of R. Yitzchak b. Abba; Sanctified animals which one must restore if they go lost are subject to the oath of a pledge; animals which one must not restore are not subject to the oath, being excluded by: "to his neighbor" "and deny" [the latter variety being denied not to the neighbor, but only to the L-rd] (Bava Metzia 58b).¹²²

and deny to his neighbor - The oath of a pledge obtains whether taken by oneself or administered by others. Why so? "and deny to his neighbor" implies any manner of denial (Shevuoth 32a). 123

and deny to his neighbor - to exclude denial to [only] one of the partners [to the pledge, in which instance there is no liability for an oath] (Yerushalmi Shevuoth 5:1). 124

and deny to his neighbor - And it is written: "or if he oppress his neighbor." Why is "his neighbor" written twice? "his neighbor" — to exclude the Exalted [i.e., the realm of the sanctified]; "his neighbor" — to exclude others [i.e., idolators] (Torath Cohanim). 125

and deny to his neighbor a pledge, etc. - "And deny" — general [denial]; "a pledge or a loan" — particular; (24): "Or of all that he swears upon it" — a repetition of the general. [We have here an instance of] "General - particular - general — you induce only according to the nature of the particular," viz.: Just as the particular is explicitly that which is movable and of intrinsic monetary value, so all that is movable and of intrinsic monetary value — to exclude plots of ground, which are not movable; to exclude servants, which are likened to land possessions; to exclude contracts, which are not of intrinsic monetary value (Shevuoth 37b). 126

a pledge - [lit., "in a pledge"] — similar to the characteristic which is in a pledge, viz., monetary value — to exclude [from liability for the oath of a pledge] something which is not of monetary value (Torath Cohanim). 127

or a loan - [How does a loan fit in (to the framework of "a pledge," which implies a deposited object)?] R. Chisda answered: In an instance

where the borrower specified one of his vessels as security for the loan (Bava Metzia 48a). 128

or if he oppressed his neighbor - [How does "oppression" fit in to this context?] R. Chisda answered: In an instance where one specified one of his vessels [for the wages of his hired man, the denial of which constitutes] oppressing him (*Ibid.*).¹²⁹

5:22 Or if one find a lost object and deny it, and swear falsely in one of all the things that a man does to sin in them,

and deny it - We find [here] the punishment. Where is the exhortation? In (*Ibid.* 19:11): "and you shall not deny" (*Bava Kamma* 105b). 130

and deny it - to exclude an instance where he admits having received the object itself [but denies something else, saying, e.g.,: "I did not steal it; you lent it to me" — after which it is discovered that he did steal it, in which case he is exempt from liability for the oath] (*Ibid.*).¹³¹

and deny it - to exclude one who admits it to one of the brothers or one of the partners (Shevuoth 37a). 132

and deny it - It was taught: I might think that if one said to another: "You found two of my oxen," and the other answered: "I found only one," he is liable; it is, therefore, written: "and deny it" — to exclude an instance such as this, where there is not [complete] denial (Yerushalmi Gittin 5:3).133

and deny it - "it," and not him [so that if, for example, he admits having the object, but swears that he did not know that the claimant was its owner, after which it is discovered that he did know, he is not liable for the offering] (Yerushalmi Shevuoth 5:1).¹³⁴

and swear falsely - We find [here] the punishment. Where is the exhortation? In (*Ibid.* 19:11): "and you shall not falsify" (*Bava Kamma* 105b). 135

and swear falsely - to exclude a loan made by contract. Why so? For contracts are backed by land-security and there is no liability of an

offering for denial of land-security [See Shevuoth 37b on preceding verse] (Shevuoth 37a,b). 136

and swear falsely - From here I derive the law for those things which are manifestly false, such as mixing wine with water. Whence do I derive it for [things such as] mixing well water with honey? From: "and swear falsely" — [implying] anything which contains falsehood (Torath Cohanim). 137

5:23 Then it shall be if he has sinned and be guilty, that he shall return the theft that he has stolen or the oppression wherein he has oppressed or the pledge which was deposited with him or the lost object which he found.

that he shall return - [that which is subject to "returning" — to exclude less than the value of a *perutah*, which is not subject to "returning," and, not being subject to returning, does not cause one to transgress the commandment against stealing [(Rashi on Sanhedrin 57a).¹³⁸

that he has stolen - Ravah said: A change [in the stolen object] causes the thief to acquire it, as it is written: "that he shall return the theft that he has stolen" — if it [the stolen object] is as he has stolen it, he must return [the object itself], and if not, it is money in general that he must pay [having acquired the object by the change] (Bava Kamma 66a).¹³⁹

that he has stolen - ["that he has stolen"], whence we derive that he adds a fifth to his theft, but not to that of his father (Ibid. b). 140

that he has stolen - as he has stolen it — whence it is derived that if he stole a coin, which later went out of circulation; fruit [the lesser portion of] which rotted; terumah, which became unclean; leavened bread, which he retained during Pesach [and so may not be eaten]; a beast, upon which an abomination was performed; an ox slated for stoning, whose sentence had not yet been formally decreed [the objects in all of these instances still appearing as they did when they were stolen, though, in the interim, having lost their value] — the thief may say: "Here is your object" [i.e., he is not obligated to compensate the owner for the loss in value] (Bava Kamma 98b). 141

that he has stolen - as he has stolen it — whence it is derived that if one stole [food] and fed it to his sons, they are exempt from paying; if he placed it before them, they are obliged [to return it] (*Ibid.* 112a). 142

that he has stolen - Shmuel said: Estimates are not made for the thief or for the robber [i.e., we do not estimate the value of a stolen object that he has broken and allow him to return that and the difference to the owner]. Whence is this derived? From: "that he shall return the theft that he has stolen" — as he has stolen it (Yerushalmi Bava Kamma 1:4).143

5:24 Or of all that he swears upon it falsely, then he shall pay it with its principal, and its fifth he shall add to it; to whom it belongs he shall give it on the day of his guilt.

Or of all that he swears upon it falsely - R. Nachman said: Rabbah b. Avuhah said in the name of Rav: "Or of all that he swears upon it"—to include a loan in [the obligation of] restoration, it not being repeated in the [preceding] verse [as the others are] (Bava Metzia 48a). 144

that he swears - to include a self-administered oath (Rashi on Shevuoth 31a). 145

that he swears upon it - "upon it" — intending it [i.e., the falsehood — to exclude an instance in which he mistakenly thought he was swearing to the truth, in which case he is exempt] (Torath Cohanim). 146

with its principal, and its fifth - Money which is paid with its principal [only — nothing intervening afterwards,] adds a fifth; money which is not paid with its principal [only — kefel (double payment) or "four or five times" payment following the payment of the principal] does not add a fifth [whence it is derived that the fifth is paid only with the principal and not with double payment or "four or five times" payment]; but the guilt-offering is brought, for it is written (25): "And his "— "And" cuts off the [preceding] verse [so that the guilt-offering is not dependent upon the sequence stipulated there] (Bava Kamma 65b). 147

and its fifth - If he gave the claimant the principal, and swore that he

had given him the fifth [and subsequently admitted that he had sworn falsely, the fifth is accounted a principal and] he pays a fifth on the fifth [and so, progressively,] until the principal is less than the value of a perutah. And so with a pledge, for it is written: "and its fifth [lit., "its fifths"] he shall add to it" — the Torah added many fifths for one principal (Bava Kamma 103b; 108a). 148

to whom it belongs - If one steals the value of a perutah from his neighbor, and swears to him, [after which he admits that he has sworn falsely], he must take it to him even until Media, it being written: "to whom it belongs he shall give it" (Rashi on *Ibid.* 103a). 149

to whom it belongs he shall give it - to him, and not to his [the sender's] messenger. I might think even not to the messenger of beth-din or to his heir; it is, therefore, written "he shall give it" (Torath Cohanim). 150

on the day of his guilt - as on the day he stole it (Torath Cohanim).

- 5:25 And his guilt-offering he shall bring to the L-rd, as ram without blemish from the flock, according to your valuation for a guilt-offering, to the priest.
- 5:26 And the priest shall make atonement for him before the L-rd, and it shall be forgiven him, on one of all that he does to be guilty therein.

on one - to make him liable for each one. How so? If there were five claimants against him, each one saying: "Return my pledge to me," and he answered: "I swear that I owe neither you nor you nor you" — or if one said to him: "Return to me my pledge, my loan, my stolen object, and my lost object," and he answered: "I swear that I owe you neither pledge nor loan nor stolen object nor lost object" — he is liable for each one individually (Torath Cohanim). 151

to be guilty therein - to exclude less than the value of a perutah (Yerushalmi Kiddushin 1:1).¹⁵²

Tzav

- 6:1 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying:
- 6:2 Command Aaron and his sons, saying: This is the law of the burnt-offering. It is the burnt-offering upon its firewood on the altar all the night until the morning; and the fire of the altar shall be kindled thereby.

Command - "Command" connotes a prompting to zeal, for the immediate situation and for future generations. R. Shimon said: [Such prompting is] all the more necessary where no profit is to be derived [the priests not benefitting from the burnt-offering] (Torath Cohanim).

This is the law of the burnt-offering - It was taught: From here I learn only that the things which are presented at night [the limbs and the fatpieces] are offered up and caused to smoke from sundown, and continue being consumed the entire night. Whence do I derive that the things which are presented in the daytime [the fistful, the frankincense, the incense, the meal-offering of the priests, the meal-offering of the anointed priest, and the meal-offering of libations — all subsumed under (*Ibid.* 7:38): "on the day that He commanded"] are offered up and caused to smoke from sundown, and continue being consumed the entire night? From: "This is the law of the burnt-offering" [further inclusion being intimated] (Menachoth 26b).²

It is the burnt-offering - The altar sanctifies what is appropriate for it [i.e., even what has become invalidated is sanctified by the altar, and once brought up to it is not taken down from it]. And what is appropriate for it? R. Yehoshua said: All that is appropriate for the fire [i.e., all flesh that must be burned on the altar], as it is written: "It is the burnt-offering upon its fire-wood." Just as the burnt-offering, which is

appropriate for the fire, once it goes up does not come down, so all that is appropriate for the fire, once it goes up does not come down (Zevachim 83a).^{3,4}

It is the burnt-offering - It was taught: R. Yehudah says: "This," "It," "the burnt-offering" — three things are being excluded here: an animal that was slaughtered at night, one whose blood was spilled out, and one whose blood was brought outside of the curtains — in which cases, if it was brought up to the altar, it is taken down (*Ibid.* 84a).

upon its fire-wood - This is the big wood-pile (Yoma 48a).6

all the night until the morning - This teaches us that the entire night is appropriate for the smoking of fats and devoted portions (Megillah 21a).⁷

all the night until the morning - Doesn't "all the night" imply "until the morning"? Why must I be told: "until the morning"? Add a morning [the rising of the morning star] to the morning of night [i.e., after midnight], whence it is derived that limbs [hardened by the fire but not completely burned] which sprang off the altar before midnight must be returned; after midnight, they need not be returned (Yoma 20b).

and the fire of the altar shall be kindled thereby - This is the second wood-pile, that for [the kindling of] the incense (Yoma 48a).9

6:3 And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and linen breeches he shall put upon his flesh, and he shall lift up the ashes from the fire consuming the burnt-offering upon the altar, and he shall place them beside the altar.

And the priest shall put on his linen garment - What is the [specific] intent of "middo" ["his garment"]? "Kemiddato" [fit to size] (Ibid. 23b). 10

and linen breeches he shall put upon his flesh - What is the intent of "he shall put upon" — to allow the putting on of worn-out breeches (*Ibid.* 12b).¹¹

upon his flesh - It was taught: Whence is it derived that he should not put on anything before his breeches? From: "and linen breeches he shall put upon his fleh" (*Ibid.* 23b). 12

upon his flesh - This teaches us that there should be nothing intervening between it and his flesh (Zevachim 19a).¹³

and he shall lift up - It is written here: "and he shall lift up," and, in respect to the meal-offering (8): "And he shall lift up." Just as there, the amount is a fistful, here, too, it is a fistful (Yoma 24a).¹⁴

and he shall lift up - [This implies that he must leave over a little] (Yerushalmi Yoma 2:1).15

and he shall lift up the ashes - It was taught: One who derives benefit from the ashes of the ash - mound on the altar is guilty of profanation. Why so? For it is written: "And the priest shall put on his linen garment... and lift up" — Since it requires priestly vestments, it retains its state of sanctity (Me'ilah 9a).16

and he shall lift up the ashes - to teach you that there is no "lording" it in the palace of the King (Yerushalmi Shabbath 10:3). 17

and he shall lift up the ashes - And above, it is written (2): "all the night," whence it is derived that the lifting up of the ashes may be performed the entire night (Yerushalmi Yoma 2:1).¹⁸

from the fire consuming [lit., "that the fire shall consume"] - From here it is derived that sprung-off pieces must be returned to the altar (Zevachim 83b).¹⁹

from the fire consuming [lit., "that the fire shall eat"] - "Eating" is not less than the size of an olive [whence it is derived that he should not lift up less than an olive - size] (Yerushalmi Yoma 2:1).²⁰

from the fire consuming - I might think that this refers to the ashes of the wood; it is, therefore, written: "burnt-offering." If "burnt-offering," I might think that this refers to the limbs of the burnt-offering; it is, therefore, written: "from the fire consuming" [lit., "that the fire shall consume"]. How is this effected? He scoops out the inner coals [i.e., wholly consumed portions], and goes down (*Ibid.*).²¹

the burnt-offering - R. Chanina taught: "from the fire consuming the burnt-offering" [Why state: "the burnt-offering"? To teach that] impartially consumed pieces of the burnt-offering must be returned to the altar, but not impartially consumed frankincense (Zevachim 83b).²²

upon the altar - It was taught: Whence is it derived that limbs and fatpieces that had not been consumed since the evening are arranged on the altar until they form a large pile and are burned? From: "from the fire consuming the burnt-offering upon the altar" (Yoma 45b).²³

and he shall place them beside the altar - "and he shall place them" — gently; "and he shall place them" — all of them; "and he shall place them" — that they not scatter (*Temurah* 34a).²⁴

and he shall place them beside the altar - This teaches us that they need secreting (Krituth 6a).²⁵

and he shall place them beside the altar - [This teaches us that it is a mitzvah to remove the ashes from the altar] (Me'ilah 12a).²⁶

6:4 And he shall take off his garments, and put on other garments, and he shall take out the ashes outside the camp to a clean place.

and he shall put on other garments - R. Yochanan said: Whence is the changing of clothing [as a sign of deference] scripturally derived? From: "And he shall take off his garments and put on other garments." And it was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: The clothing which one wore to cook a dish for his master he should not wear to pour a cup for his master (Shabbath 104a).^{27,28}

and he shall put on other garments - The Rabbis taught: I might think that just as on Yom Kippur [the high priest changes from garments of gold to white garments], so he [the priest here] takes off his sanctified garments and puts on everyday clothes; it is, therefore, written: "And he shall take off" - "and he shall put on." The garments that he puts on are being likened to those that he takes off. Just as the garments he takes off are sanctified, so those he puts on must be sanctified. If so, what is the intent of "other" — lesser [in value] than the first (Yoma 23b).²⁹

6:5 And the fire upon the altar shall burn thereby; it shall not be extinguished. And the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning. And he shall arrange the burnt-offering upon it. And he shall cause to smoke upon it the fats of the peace-offerings.

And the fire - It was taught: Every day there were three wood-piles on the altar: the large wood-pile [on which was offered up the daily burnt-offering and the other offerings], the wood-pile [which served to provide fuel for the daily smoking] of the incense, and the wood-pile for the sustenance of the fire [on the large wood-pile]; and on Yom Kippur one was added, as it is written: "And the fire" (*Ibid.* 45b).³⁰

And the fire - It was taught: R. Yossi says: Whence is it derived that a wood-pile is provided for the sustenance of the fire? From: "And the fire upon the altar shall burn thereby" (*Ibid.* a).³¹

and he shall kindle upon it - It was taught: The [setting up of] the second wood pile of the incense takes precedence to the arrangement of the two logs [on the large wood-pile], for it is written: "and the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning" — on it [the large wood-pile], and not on its neighbor [the second wood-pile], the implication being that "its neighbor" had already been set up (Ibid. 33a).³²

wood ... every morning - The arrangement of the two logs takes precedence to removal of the ashes from the inner altar. And even though it is written here: "every morning," and, in respect to [the smoking of] the incense [on the inner altar] (*Exodus* 30:7): "every morning," even so, an auxiliary [the arrangement of the logs, without which the offering cannot be burned,] takes precedence [to an incidental, i.e., the removal of the ashes] (*Ibid.*).³³

every morning - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "every morning" [lit., "in the morning in the morning"] — Scripture hereby provides a boundary for the morning of the morning [the morning of the rising of the morning star being the boundary of the morning of sunrise, so that the first may be regarded as "morning" for sacrificial purposes [(Ibid.).³⁴]

And he shall arrange the burnt-offering upon it - It was taught:

Whence is it derived that nothing is to take precedence to the daily morning burnt-offering? From: "And he shall arrange the burnt-offering upon it." What is the intent of this? Rava said: "the burnt-offering" — the first burnt-offering (Pesachim 58a).³⁵

And he shall arrange the burnt-offering upon it - It was taught: Whence is it derived that they set up a wood-pile large enough to accommodate all of the burnt-offerings? From: "And he shall arrange the [generic] burnt-offering upon it" (Torath Cohanim).³⁶

the fats of the peace-offerings - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that nothing is offered up later than the daily afternoon burnt-offering? From: "And he shall cause to smoke upon it the fats of the peace-offerings." What is the intent of this? Rava said: "the peace-offerings" [lit., "the completers"] — With it, [the daily afternoon burnt-offering,] complete all of the offerings (*Pesachim* 58b).³⁷

the fats of the peace-offerings - R. Cahana asked: It is written (Exodus 23:18): "and the fat of My sacrifice shall not remain until the morning" — Until the morning it may not remain, but all the night it may remain [to be offered up]; and it is written [here]: "And he shall cause to smoke upon it the fats of the peace-offerings" — With it complete all the offerings [see above]! He asked it and he answered it — [The verse in Exodus is referring to offerings] that were left over [i.e., their blood was sprinkled immediately before the daily burnt-offering, and since they were thus validated for offering, they may be offered the entire night] (Ibid. 59b). 18-40

6:6 A continuous fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall not be extinguished.

A continuous fire - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the fire for the menorah is taken from the outer altar? From: "A continuous fire shall burn upon the altar." The continuous fire that I told you of [in respect to the menorah (see *Exodus* 27:20)] should be kindled only from the head of the outer altar (*Yoma* 45b).⁴¹

A continuous fire - "continuous" — even on the Sabbath; "continuous"

— even [if the priests are] in a state of uncleanliness [and cannot sacrifice] (Yerushalmi Yoma 4:6).⁴²

shall burn upon the altar - From here we derive that the second woodpile, that of the incense, was also to be on the outer altar (Yoma 45b).⁴³

it shall not be extinguished - R. Eliezer b. Yaakov taught: Because the Torah commanded to remove the ashes, I might think he should extinguish [any residual flame] and remove what was left; it is, therefore, written: "it shall not be extinguished" (Zevachim 91b).44

it shall not be extinguished - "it shall not be extinguished" — even during their journeyings. What did they do during their journeyings? They placed a large vessel upon the fire (Yerushalmi Yoma 4:6).45

6:7 And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall bring it near before the L-rd in front of the altar.

And this is the law - "This" — it does not apply to a bamah [a temporary altar] (Torath Cohanim).

And this is the law of the meal-offering - There is one law for all meal-offerings, that their remainder be eaten by the priests (*Menachoth* 27b). 46

And this is the law of the meal-offering - There is one law for all meal-offerings, that they require oil and frankincense (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴⁷

shall bring it near - "it" — one that is valid, and not one that has become unfit; "it" — all of it at the same time (*Ibid.*).48

the sons of Aaron - The presentations are performed by men and not by women, as it is written: "the sons of Aaron shall bring it near" — the sons of Aaron, and not the daughters of Aaron (Kiddushin 36a). 49

before the L-rd - I might think, in the west, [opposite the entrance to the sanctuary]; it is, therefore, written: "in front of the altar." If "in front of the altar," I might think in the south [the ramp being in the south]; it is, therefore, written: "before the L-rd." How is this effected? It is presented at the southwest corner at the point of the corner, this being sufficient (Zevachim 63b). 50

in front of the altar - The Rabbis taught: The ramp of the altar is an invalidating factor [i.e., failure to use it invalidates the offering]. Why so? R. Huna said: Wherever "the altar" is mentioned, the invalidating factor is operative [and the ramp is called "the front of the altar"] (*Ibid.* 62a). 51

6:8 And he shall lift up from it with his fistful from the fine flour of the meal-offering and from its oil and all the frankincense that is on the meal-offering; and he shall cause it to smoke upon the altar, a sweet savor, a remembrance to the L-rd.

And he shall lift up from it - "from it," from what is all joined together, that he not bring one issaron [a tenth of an ephah] in two vessels and take a fistful (Menachoth 24a).⁵²

and all the frankincense - The Rabbis taught: If the frankincense was diminished to one grain it is invalid; if to two grains, it is valid. These are the words of R. Yehudah. What is the reason? It is written: "and all the frankincense" — "all" [kol, implying all that there is of it], even one grain; "et" [Heb. "et kol"], to add an additional grain (Ibid. 11b).⁵³

and all the frankincense - The Rabbis taught: If one says: "I vow to offer frankincense," he should not bring less than a fistful. Whence is this derived? From: "And he shall lift up from it with his fistful from the fine flour of the meal-offering and from its oil and from all the frankincense." The frankincense is compared to the lifting of the meal-offering. Just as the lifting of the meal-offering is with a fistful, so the amount for the frankincense is a fistful (*Ibid.* 106b).⁵⁴

that is on the meal-offering - What is the intent of this? To teach that the frankincense on the meal-offering suffices with a grain, but frankincense which is offered independently requires a fistful in the beginning [when the fistful is taken] and a fistful at the end [when it is smoked] (*Ibid.* 11b).55

6:9 And what is left of it shall be eaten by Aaron and his sons.

It shall be eaten unleavened; in a holy place, in the court of the tent of meeting shall they eat it.

And what is left of it - "of it," a valid offering, and not an invalid one (Torath Cohanim). 6

It shall be eaten unleavened - It was taught: "It shall be eaten unleavened" — this is a mitzvah. For I might think that since in the beginning [before it was sanctified], it was in the category of the permitted [i.e., it could be eaten either leavened or unleavened], and then [after it was sanctified until the fistful was taken] it became forbidden, and then [after the fistful was taken] it became permitted again — I might think that it returned to its original permissibility; it is, therefore, written: "It shall be eaten unleavened" — it is a mitzvah (Yevamoth 46a).⁵⁷

It shall be eaten unleavened - What is the intent of this? Because it is written: "shall they eat it," I might think only all of it [i.e., only if the entire remainder is intact]; whence do I derive [that] even part of it [is to be eaten]? From: "it shall be eaten" — in any event (Torath Cohanim). 58

in the court of the tent of meeting - It was taught: If chambers were built in a non-sanctified area and opened up into the sanctified area — whence is it derived that the priests may enter there to eat of the higher order offerings and of the remainder of the meal-offering? From: "in the court of the tent of meeting shall they eat it" — the Torah herein included many courts for one eating (Zevachim 56a). 59,60

shall they eat it - What is the intent of this? To include their eating it with any food [i.e., seasoning] they desired (*Torath Cohanim*).⁶¹

6:10 It shall not be baked with leaven. Their portion have I given it of my fire-offerings; it is holy of holies, as the sin-offering and as the guilt-offering.

It shall not be baked with leaven - It was taught: Baking was in the category of (*Ibid.* 2:11): "It shall not be made of leaven." Why did it leave that category [to be singled out here]? So that it serve as the basis

for a comparison. Just as baking is characterized by its being a particular act and subject to liability in and of itself, so all particular acts in respect to it are subject to liability in and of themselves (Menachoth 55b).⁶²

It shall not be baked with leaven. Their portion - What is the intent of "Their portion"? To teach that even their [the priests'] portion may not be baked with leaven (*Ibid.* a).⁶³

of my fire-offerings, etc. - This teaches us that they are not permitted to take it until all the fire-offerings have been offered up. Whence is it derived that the same holds true for all the offerings? From: "it is holy of holies." I might think that if it were apportioned before the other offerings it is invalidated; it is, therefore, written: "it is holy of holies" — it remains in its holiness (Torath Cohanim).

as the sin-offering and as the guilt-offering - It was taught: R. Shimon said: "it is holy of holies, as the sin-offering and as the guilt-offering." [To what end] did the Torah liken this to a sin-offering and to a guilt-offering? [To teach that in the general category of meal-offerings is that which is similar to a sin-offering and that which is similar to a guilt-offering.] The meal-offering of a "sinner" [in defilement of the sanctuary or of sanctified objects] is similar to a sin-offering; therefore, if the fistful were not taken for the express purpose of that offering, it is invalid. A gift meal-offering is similar to a guilt-offering, so that [even] if the fistful were not taken for the express purpose of that offering, it retains its validity (Zevachim 11a).64

6:11 Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat it; it is a statute forever for your generations of the fire-offerings of the L-rd. All that touch them shall become sanctified.

Every male - The daughter of a priest does not eat of the "holy of holies." it being written: "Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat it" (Sotah 23b).65

Every male - The Rabbis taught: "Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat it" — to include those with blemishes. To what end is this stated? If to permit them to eat [what is offered them by another

priest], it is already written (*Ibid.* 21:22): "The bread of his G-d, of the holy of holies shall he eat." It must be, then, to include them in the apportionment (*Zevachim* 102a).66

shall eat it - if it is fit, but not if it has been invalidated (Torath Cohanim).

- 6:12 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 6:13 This is the offering of Aaron and his sons, which they shall offer up to the L-rd on the day that he is anointed; the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, a perpetual meal-offering half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening.

This is the offering of Aaron and his sons - It was taught: "This is the offering of Aaron and his sons." I might think that Aaron and his sons offer up one sacrifice; it is, therefore, written: "which they shall offer up to the L-rd," Aaron individually, and his sons individually (Menachoth 51b).67

the offering of Aaron and his sons - It was taught: "his sons" — these are the lesser priests. But perhaps they are the high priests [i.e., the lineal descendants of Aaron]? When it is written (15): "And the priest anointed in his place, from among his sons, shall offer it," the high priest is already referred to. How are "his sons," then, to be understood? As the lesser priests (*Ibid.*).68

the offering of Aaron and his sons - R. Nachman b. R. Chisda expounded: "This is the offering of Aaron and his sons... on the day that he is anointed." What is the connection between his sons and his anointment? To liken his [a lesser priest's] investiture to his [the high priest's] anointment. Just as his [offering of] anointment is soaked [see 14], so his [offering of] investiture is soaked (*Ibid.* 78a).^{69,70}

on the day that he is anointed - This teaches us that the high priest is anointed only in the daytime (Torath Cohanim).

on the day that he is anointed - "he" — this teaches us that only one high priest is anointed, and not two. Why so? R. Yochanan said: To prevent envy (Yerushalmi Yoma 1:1).⁷²

a perpetual meal-offering - "Perpetual" is stated in respect to the meal-offering of the griddle [the daily meal-offering of the high-priest, so-called because it is brought upon a griddle], and "perpetual" is stated in respect to the show-bread; just as the show-bread consists of twelve loaves, the meal-offering of the griddle, too, consists of twelve loaves (*Ibid.*).⁷³

a perpetual meal-offering - This teaches us that the high priest brings one-tenth of an ephah from the day he is anointed and thenceforeward, for it is written: "a perpetual meal-offering" (Torath Cohanim).⁷⁴

half of it - It was taught: R. Yochanan says: The griddle offerings of the high priest cannot be sanctified by halves. Why so? For it is written: "meal-offering, half of it"—first bring the meal-offering [i.e., a complete meal-offering], and then halve it (Menachoth 8a).⁷⁵

half of it in the morning, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening" — this teaches us that he offers up half of a complete meal-offering. How so? He brings a complete issaron [one-tenth of an ephah] and divides it, and offers up half in the morning and half in the evening (*Ibid.* 50b).⁷⁶

half of it in the morning, etc. - The Rabbis taught: If the half for the afternoon became unclean or were lost, I might think that in the evening he brings half an *issaron* from his house and offers that up; it is, therefore, written: "half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening" — he offers up half of a complete one. Therefore, he brings a whole *issaron*, divides it, offers up half, and half is lost [i.e., it must be burned] (*Ibid.*).⁷⁷

half of it in the morning, etc. - The Rabbis taught: If the high priest offered up half in the morning and then died, and another was appointed in his place, I might think he brings half an *issaron* from his house or the half-*issaron* of the first; it is, therefore, written: "and half of it in the evening" — he offers up half of a complete one. Therefore, he brings a whole *issaron*, divides it, offers up half, and half is lost (*Ibid.*)."

6:14 On a griddle, with oil, shall it be made; soaked shall you bring it; well-baked, a meal-offering of pieces shall you offer it, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

On a griddle - This teaches us that it requires a ministering vessel; therefore, if it had been baked the previous day it is invalidated by missing the time of its offering; and, therefore, its offering countermands the [prohibition of labor on] the Sabbath (*Ibid.* 51a).

with oil - Oil must be added; but I do not know how much! I, therefore, induce: It is written here: "oil," and, in respect to the meal-offering of libations (*Exodus* 29:40): "oil." Just as in the meal-offering of libations there are three logs of oil to the issaron, here, too, there are three logs to the issaron (Ibid.). 80

shall it be made - even on the Sabbath; even in a state of uncleanliness (*Ibid.*).81

soaked - This teaches us that it is scalded with water as required (Torath Cohanim).82

shall you bring it - "shall you bring it" — in any event, even after the additional offerings and after the libations (*Ibid.*).

well-baked - [Heb., "tufinei"] What is "tufinei"? "Tofenah na" [Bake it lightly]; "Tofenah naeh" [Bake it beautifully]. Therefore, he bakes it and fries it [this constituting baking it beautifully], and then he re-bakes it [lightly] (Menachoth 50b).83

well-baked - It was taught: The griddle meal-offering of the high priest countermands the Sabbath, for it is written: "tufinei" — "Tofenah naeh" [Bake it beautifully], and if it had been baked the preceding day it becomes swollen (Ibid.).84

a meal-offering of pieces - We are hereby taught that he folds it once into two parts, then once again, into four parts, and he separates them (Torath Cohanim).⁸⁵

6:15 And the priest that is anointed in his place from his sons

shall offer it, a statute forever for the L-rd; it shall be entirely smoked.

And the priest that is anointed in his place - What is the intent of "is anointed"? To teach that even the sons of the high priest — if they are anointed, they are high priests, and if not, they are not. From here it is derived that even the high priest the son of a high priest requires anointment (*Horiyoth* 11b).86

from his sons shall offer it - The Rabbis taught: If the high priest died and another had not been appointed in his place, whence is it derived that his heirs offer up his offering? From: "And the priest that is anointed in his place from his sons [i.e., one of his sons, in the aforementioned situation,] shall offer it." I might think that he offers it by halves [as his father would have]; it is, therefore, written: "shall offer it" — "it," and not part of it (Menachoth 51b). 87,88

a statute forever - It shall be a statute forever [and not just for the investiture of Aaron and his sons] (*Ibid.*).⁸⁹

a statute forever - The griddle offerings of the high priest come as twelve loaves. Why so? It is derived: "statute" from the show-bread [which is brought in twelve loaves (see *Ibid.* 24:8-9)] (*Ibid.* 76a).90

it shall be entirely smoked - It is written here: "entirely," and, in respect to the meal-offering of an ordinary priest (16): "entirely." Just as the meal-offering of an ordinary priest comes under (*Ibid.*): "it shall not be eaten," so the meal-offering of a high priest comes under: "it shall not be eaten" (*Ibid.* 51b). 91

6:16 And every meal-offering of a priest shall be entirely [smoked]; it shall not be eaten.

And every meal-offering of a priest - to include his gift meal-offering (Torath Cohanim).⁹²

meal-offering of a priest - The meal-offering of the daughter of a priest is eaten; for it is written: "And every meal-offering of a *priest* shall be entirely [smoked]; it shall not be eaten." The meal-offering of a *priest*, and not that of the daughter of a priest (Sotah 23b).⁹³

shall be entirely [smoked] - From here I derive only that all of it [must meal-offering of the high priest (15): "entirely." Just as the meal-offering of the high priest is to be smoked entirely, the meal-offering of an ordinary priest, too, is to be smoked entirely (Menachoth 51b).⁹⁴

shall be entirely [smoked] - From here I derive only that all of it [must be smoked]. Whence do I derive that part of it [must also be smoked]? From: "it shall be" — any amount (Torath Cohanim).95

shall be entirely smoked; it shall not eaten - It was taught: R. Eliezer says: [This ("it shall not be eaten") applies to] anything which is subsumed under: "entirely" [and not only a meal-offering]. Scripture hereby attaches a negative commandment to its eating (*Menachoth* 74b). 96

- 6:17 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 6:18 Speak to Aaron and his sons, saying: This is the law of the sin-offering. In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered, there shall the sin-offering be slaughtered, before the L-rd; it is holy of holies.

This is the law of the sin-offering - It was taught: I might think that the blood of the sin-offering of a bird that sprinkled onto a garment would require washing; it is, therefore, written: "This" [to exclude the sin-offering of a bird] (Zevachim 92a). 97

This is the law of the sin-offering - "the law of the sin-offering" — there is one law for all sin-offerings, so that if their blood sprinkled onto a garment, washing is required, both in the case of sin-offerings that are eaten and those whose blood is sprinkled within [and which are not eaten, but burned] (*Ibid.*). 98

This is the law of the sin-offering - R. Yitzchak said: That which is written: "This is the law of the sin-offering" teaches that if one studies the law of the sin-offering it is as if he offers one up (Menachoth 110a).99

In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered - It was taught: The blood of the sin-offering of a bird that sprinkled onto a garment does not require washing. Why so? It is written: "In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered" — Scripture speaks of what is slaughtered [to exclude birds, which are not slaughtered, but pinched] (Zevachim 92a). 100

In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered - Where is that? In the north [of the altar] (*Ibid.* 48a). 101

There shall the sin-offering be slaughtered - Why so? So as not to publicize the sinners [by according them a distinct locale for the slaughtering of sin-offerings] (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 8:3). 102

it is holy of holies - "holy of holies" — to include communal peaceofferings in the stricture of "the north"; "it" — to exclude the ram of
the Nazir and the thank-offering [(which are lower-order sanctities)
from the stricture of "the north"] (Torath Cohanim). 103

6:19 The priest that offers it as a sin-offering shall eat it. In a holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tent of meeting.

The priest that offers it as a sin-offering - one who immersed in the daytime [and is not clean until the evening] and one lacking atonement may not take a share of the sanctified offerings to eat thereof in the evening, for it is written: "The priest that offers it as a sin-offering shall eat it." What is the intent of "shall eat it"? [i.e., Are not all the priests of that watch permitted to eat it?] He shall take a share of it. Therefore, a priest that may sacrifice the offering takes a share of it, and one that may not sacrifice it does not take a share (Zevachim 95 a). 104

The priest that offers it - What is the intent of "it"? "It" requires sprinkling of blood above the upper half of the altar, but the blood of other offerings does not require the sprinkling of blood above the upper half of the altar (*Ibid.* 10b). 105

6:20 All that touches its flesh shall be sanctified. And what

shall be sprinkled of its blood upon a garment, that which has been sprinkled on, you shall wash in a holy place.

All that touches - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if it touched only a piece, the entire thing becomes unfit; it is, therefore, written: "that touches" — that which touches becomes unfit. What does he do [in such a situation]? He cuts off the part that has absorbed [what has been exuded by the flesh of the sin-offering] (*Ibid.* 97b). 106

that touches its flesh - I might think that contact without absorption [renders it unfit]; it is, therefore, written: "its flesh" — until it be absorbed in its flesh (*Ibid.*). 107

in its flesh - "its flesh" — and not its sinews, bones, hooves, or horns (*Ibid.*). 108

shall be sanctified - to be as it. If it is unfit, what touches it becomes unfit [if it is sanctified]; and if it is fit, what touches it [if it is sanctified] is eaten with all of the stringencies attending the first (*Ibid.*). 109

And what shall be sprinkled - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if the blood ricocheted from the corner or from the foundation of the altar the garment requires washing; it is, therefore, written: "And what shall be sprinkled" — to exclude what has already been sprinkled (*Ibid.* 93a). 110

And what shall be sprinkled of its blood - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if blood from the neck spurted onto a garment it requires washing; it is, therefore, written: "And what shall be sprinkled of its blood" — only blood that is fit for sprinkling [i.e., that blood which is collected in a vessel] is being referred to (*Ibid.*).¹¹¹

of its blood - The Rabbis taught: "of its blood" — of blood that is fit, and not of blood that is unfit, whether there was or was not a time when it was fit. Why so? For it is written: "of its blood," and (22): ["may eat] it" — one referring to a time when it was fit and the other to a time when it was not fit (Ibid.). "

onto a garment - The Rabbis taught: This teaches me only about a garment. Whence do I derive for inclusion [in this law] skin that has been stripped from the animal? From: "garment." Just as a garment

may acquire uncleanliness, so, all that may acquire uncleanliness (*Ibid.* b). 113

onto a garment - It was taught: R. Eliezer said: This teaches me only about a garment. Whence do I derive for inclusion [in this law] sacks and all kinds of vestments? From: "upon it [lit., "that which has been sprinkled upon it"] you shall wash" (Ibid. 94a). 114

that which has been sprinkled on - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if only a part of the garment were sprinkled upon, the entire garment required washing; it is, therefore, written: "that which has been sprinkled on" — the place of the blood alone (*Ibid.*). 115

you shall wash - This teaches us that only what lends itself to washing acquires [this] uncleanliness, to exclude utensils, which require scouring (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁶

in a holy place - This teaches us that the washing must be done in a holy place (*Ibid.*). 117

6:21 And an earthen vessel in which it is cooked shall be broken. And if it is cooked in a copper vessel, it shall be scoured and rinsed with water.

And an earthen vessel, etc. - ["And an earthen vessel" — the class of earthenware] to include vessels made of alum crystals; ["in a copper vessel" — the class of copper] to include all the other metals (Torath Cohanim).

in which it is cooked - This tells me only of cooking in it. Whence do we derive [the application of the same law for] pouring into it what is boiling? From: "in which it is cooked shall be broken" — in any event (Zevachim 95b). 118

shall be broken - [And above it is written (20): "you shall wash in a holy place." Breaking is being likened to washing. Just as washing, in a holy place, so, breaking, in a holy place] (*Ibid.* 94b). 119

And if it is cooked in a copper vessel - It was taught: It it were cooked in part of the vessel, all of the vessel requires scouring and rinsing. Why

so? For it is written: "And if it is cooked in a copper vessel" — even part of the vessel (*Ibid.* 96b). 120

it shall be scoured and rinsed - [And above it is written (20): "you shall wash in a holy place." Scouring and rinsing are being likened to washing. Just as washing, in a holy place, so scouring and rinsing, in a holy place] (*Ibid.* 94b). 121

it shall be scoured and rinsed - What is "scouring"? What is "rinsing"? Scouring, as in the manner of scouring the cup for grace; rinsing, as in the manner of rinsing the cup for grace (*Ibid.* 96b).¹²²

it shall be scoured and rinsed - What is "scouring"? What is "rinsing"? Scouring, with hot water; rinsing, with cold water (*Ibid.*). 123

it shall be scoured and rinsed - When is it to be scoured and rinsed? By the end of the time in which the offering may be eaten [to insure that no nothar (remnant of the offering beyond the permitted eating time) be left in the vessel], as it is written: "it shall be scoured and rinsed," followed by (22): "Every male among the priests may eat it." How so? He waits until the time of eating and then scours and rinses (*Ibid.* 97a). 124

with water - and not with wine or diluted wine (Ibid. 96b). 125

6:22 Every male among the priests may eat it; it is holy of holies.

Every male among the priests - "Every" — to include those with blemishes (*Ibid.* 99a). 126

it is holy of holies - to include all orders of sanctity in [the provisions for] scouring and rinsing. I might think that *terumah*, too, is included; it is, therefore, written: ["may eat] it" — to exclude *terumah* (*Ibid.* 96b).¹²⁷

6:23 And every sin-offering, whereof any of its blood is brought to the tent of meeting to make atonement in the holy place shall not be eaten; it shall be burned with fire.

And every sin-offering - It was taught: This tells me only of an individual sin-offering, a female. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in this rule] a communal sin-offering, a male? From: "And every sin-offering" (*Ibid.* 82a). 128,129

whereof any of its blood is brought - "of its blood" — even part of it (*Ibid.*).¹³⁰

whereof any of its blood is brought - "of its blood" — and not of its flesh [the offering not being invalidated if the flesh is brought within] (Ibid. b).¹³¹

to the tent of meeting - This tells me only of the tent of meeting. Whence do I derive [the application of this rule to] Shiloh and the Eternal House [i.e., the Temple]? From: "to make atonement in the holy place" (*Torath Cohanim*). 132

to make atonement in the holy place - It was taught: R. Shimon says: It is written here: "to make atonement in the holy place," and, elsewhere (*Ibid.* 16:27): "And the bullock of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place." Just as there, the atonement has already been made, here, too, the [instance is one in which the] atonement has already been made [the offering not being invalidated through mere entry of the blood without the making of atonement] (*Zevachim* 83a). 133

it shall be burned with fire - It was taught: R. Shimon says: "in the holy place ... it shall be burned with fire." This teaches us that the sin-offering is burned in a holy place [the azarah]. This tells me only of the sin-offering alone. Whence do I derive [the same rule for] invalidated higher-order offerings and devoted portions of lower-order offerings? From: "And every ... in the holy place ... it shall be burned with fire" (Pesachim 24a). 134

it shall be burned with fire - R. Huna said: If libations became unclean, a separate wood-pile is made for them, and they are burned, as it is written: "in the holy place ... it shall be burned with fire" (Zevachim 92a).¹³⁵

7:1 And this is the law of the guilt-offering; it is holy of holies.

And this is the law f the guilt-offering - R. Yitzchak said: That which is written: "And this is the law of the guilt-offering" teaches that if one studies the law of the guilt-offering it is as if he offers one up (Menachoth 110a).

the law of the guilt-offering - There is one law for all the guilt-offerings — that their blood be sprinkled below [roundabout the altar] (*Torath Cohanim*).

7:2 In the place where they slaughter the burnt-offering shall they slaughter the guilt-offering; and its blood shall he sprinkle on the altar roundabout.

where they slaughter the burnt-offering - From here it is derived that the guilt-offering requires slaughtering in the north [of the altar]. From here I derive only the *mitzvah*. Whence do I derive the invalidating factor [i.e., that the offering is invalid *unless* slaughtered in the north]? From (*Ibid.* 14:13): "And he shall slaughter the lamb [the guilt-offering of the leper] in the place where he slaughters the sin-offering and the burnt-offering" (*Zevachim* 49a).^{2,3}

shall they slaughter - Many slaughterers are herein subsumed, even converts, women, and servants (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴

and its blood shall he sprinkle - [Sprinkling is juxtaposed with slaughtering; just as slaughtering is in the north (of the altar), so is receiving (of the blood) in the north] Whence do we derive that the receiving priest himself must stand in the north [and not just stretch out his hand in that direction]? From: "ve'eth damo" [lit., "and with its blood," an additional inclusion being implied] (Zevachim 49a).

- 7:3 And all of its fat he shall offer of it: the tail and the fat that covers the innards.
- 7:4 And the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the loins, and the lobe above the liver by the kidneys, he shall remove it.

- 7:5 And the priest shall cause them to smoke upon the altar, a fire-offering to the L-rd; it is a guilt-offering.
- 7:6 Every male among the priests may eat thereof. In a holy place shall it be eaten; it is holy of holies.
- 7:7 As the sin-offering, so the guilt-offering. There is one law for them. The priest that makes atonement with them, to him shall it be

As the sin-offering, so the guilt-offering - Just as the sin-offering requires placing of the hands, as it is written (*Ibid.* 4:29): "And he shall place his hand on the head of the sin-offering," so the guilt-offering requires placing of the hands (*Ibid.* 11a).

to him shall it be - [This teaches us that its bones, too, are permitted] (Tosafoth, Zevachim 86a).6

to him shall it be - to exclude one who has immersed in the daytime [and is not clean until the evening], one lacking atonement, and a mourner (*Torath Cohanim*).

7:8 And the priest that offers up the burnt-offering of a man, the skin of the burnt-offering which he offered up is the priest's; to him shall it be.

the burnt-offering of a man - to exclude a burnt-offering of [i.e., devoted to] the Temple, where the skin does not go to the priests [but is sold, and its monies given to the Temple] (Zevachim 103a).⁷

the burnt-offering of a man - a burnt-offering that is accounted "a man's," to exclude one that was slaughtered with an intention counter to the appropriate time or the appropriate place [in which case it is invalid and is not considered his] (*Ibid.*).⁸

the skin of the burnt-offering - Just as a burnt-offering is of higher-order sanctity, so all that is of higher-order sanctity, to exclude offerings

of lower-order sanctity, where the skin does not revert to the priests (*Ibid.*).9

the skin of the burnt-offering - "the burnt-offering" — to include the burnt-offerings of converts, women, and servants, and to include a burnt-offering which was not expressly slaughtered as such [in which case, though one's obligation is not satisfied thereby, since it is a valid offering it can be considered "the burnt-offering of a man"] (*Ibid.* b). 10

which he offered up - to include the skins of all the higher-order offerings [such as sin-offerings and guilt-offerings] (*Ibid.* b).¹¹

to him shall it be - It was taught: R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Yishmael: It is written in respect to a burnt-offering: "to him shall it be," and, in respect to a guilt-offering (7): "to him shall it be." Just as the bones of a guilt-offering are permitted [to the priest], so the bones of a burnt-offering (*Ibid.* 86a).¹²

to him shall it be - to exclude one who has immersed in the daytime [and is not clean until the evening], one lacking atonement, and a mourner, these not appropriating the skin (*Ibid.* 103b).¹³

7:9 And every meal-offering that is baked in the oven, and all that is made in the stewing-pan and on the griddle, to the priest who offers it up, to him shall it be.

in the stewing pan and on the griddle - It was taught: R. Chanina b. Gamliel says: "in the stewing pan and on the griddle" — this teaches us that the stewing pan was deep, and what was made in it frothed, and the griddle was flat and what was baked on it was hard [so as not to overflow] (Menachoth 63a).¹⁴

to the priest who offers it up - But elsewhere it is stated (10): "to all the sons of Aaron shall it be"! How is this possible? It is divided among the particular priestly household that offers it up (Torath Cohanim).

7:10 And every meal-offering, mixed with oil or dry, to all the sons of Aaron shall it be, one man as well as another.

a meal-offering mixed with oil - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one says: I vow a meal-offering of sixty-one issaron, he brings sixty issaron in one vessel, and one issaron in another? From: "a meal-offering mixed with oil" — Bring a meal-offering that can be mixed [with oil; and sixty-one issaron in one vessel cannot be thoroughly mixed] (Menachoth 103b). 15

one man as well as another - "one man" — even one with a blemish; "one man" — and not a minor (*Ibid.* 73b). 16

one man as well as another - It was taught: Whence is it derived that meal-offerings [of one priestly household] are not exchanged for sacrifices [of a different priestly household], for [different] meal-offerings, or for offerings of fowl? From: "to all the sons of Aaron [in one household] shall it be, one man as well as another." I might think that such an exchange can be made with lower-order offerings. It is, therefore, written: "one man as well as another," followed by (12): "If for thanksgiving [a lower-order offering] he shall offer it" (Ibid. a). 17,18

7:11 And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which one shall offer to the L-rd.

And this is the law - to equate the time factor [(an offering being invalidated by intention to eat or offer it at the improper time)] of a small bamah [a temporary, individual altar] with that of a large [communal] bamah (Zevachim 120b).¹⁹

7:12 If for thanksgiving he shall offer it, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mixed with oil, and unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes of soaked fine flour, mixed with oil.

If for thanksgiving - preceded by: "And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings" — just as peace-offerings may come from the tithe, thank-offerings, too, may come fom the tithe (*Ibid.* 50a).²⁰

If for thanksgiving - preceded by: "And this is the law of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings" — Just as peace-offerings require placing of the hands, and libations, and lifting of breast and thigh, so peace-offerings require placing of the hands, and libations, and lifting of breast and thigh (*Torath Cohanim*).²¹

If for thanksgiving, etc. - "for thanksgiving" — to include offspring, exchanges, and substitutes of a thank-offering requires loaves, but its offspring, exchange, or substitute do not require loaves (Menachoth 79b). 22,23

he shall offer it - The Rabbis taught: What is the intent of: "He shall offer it"? If one set aside a thank-offering and it was lost, and he set aside a different one in its place, after which the first was found, so that now both are standing before him — whence do we derive that he may offer up whichever he wishes, and its loaves along with it? From: "thanksgiving he shall offer." I might think that the second requires loaves; it is, therefore, written: "he shall offer it" — one [with loaves], and not two (Ibid.).²⁴

then he shall offer with the sacrifice of the thanksgiving unleavened cakes - R. Cahana said: Whence do we derive that the loaves of the thank-offering are called "thank-offering"? From: "then he shall offer up with the sacrifice of the thanksgiving unleavened cakes" (Ibid. 80b).²⁵

unleavened cakes - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the cakes are made of fine flour? From: "and cakes of soaked fine flour." Just as the soaked cakes are of fine flour, the cakes here, too, are of fine flour (Zevachim 50a).²⁶

and unleavened wafers - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the wafers are made of fine flour? From: "unleavened cakes... and unleavened wafers." Just as the cakes are of fine flour, so the wafers are of fine flour (*Ibid.*).²⁷

7:13 With cakes of leavened bread he shall offer his offering; with the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings.

With cakes of leavened bread - The Rabbis taught: "With cakes of leavened bread" — This teaches us that the bread does not become consecrated until its surface becomes crusted in the oven (*Menachoth* 78b).²⁸

With cakes of leavened bread - Rava said: The breads of the thank-offering, once they are slightly baked, are consecrated. What constitutes "slightly baked"? Not having strands trailing after when it is broken. (*Ibid.*).²⁹

With cakes of leavened bread - How much flour is brought for each loaf? This is deduced: It is written here: "bread," and, in respect to the two loaves (*Ibid.* 23:17): "bread." Just as there, an *issaron* of flour for one loaf; here, too, an *issaron* for one loaf. This tells me only of lthe levaened loaves. What of the unleavened loaves [which are brought along with the thank-offering]? It is written: "With cakes of leavened bread." Scripture is hereby telling us: In [exact] correspondence with leavened loaves bring unleavened loaves (*Ibid.* 77b). 30,31

he shall offer his offering with the sacrifice - This teaches us that the bread is not consecrated without the slaughtering of the sacrifice. (*Ibid.* 78b). ³²

the sacrifice of his thanksgiving - This teaches us that if he slaughtered it at variance with its express designation the bread is not consecrated (*Ibid.*).³³

his thanksgiving peace-offerings - The four different types of loaves of the thank-offering act as mutual invalidating factors [i.e., failure to bring the one invalidates the others]. Why so? The thank-offering is likened to the peace-offerings of the Nazirite, for it is written: "with the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings," concerning which the master said: "peace-offerings" includes the peace-offerings of the Nazirite. Just as there, there is mutual invalidation, here, too, there is mutual invalidation (*Ibid.* 27a).³⁴

the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings - The Rabbis taught: "peace-offerings," to include the peace-offerings of the Nazirite for ten Jerusalem kavs of flour and a quarter of oil. I might think that this applied to all that is stated herein; it is, therefore, written "unleavened" [as it is written in respect to the Nazirite]. The application is made only where "unleavened" is stated, to exclude soaked cakes, where "unleavened" is not stated (*Ibid.* 78a). 35, 36

7:14 And he shall offer of it, one of each offering, as a gift-offering to the L-rd. To the priest who sprinkles the blood of the peace-offerings, to him shall it be.

And he shall offer of it - It was taught: "of it" is stated in respect to the offerings, and also in respect to the Paschal lamb [(Exodus 12:43): "No stranger shall eat of it"]. Just as the "of it" in respect to the Paschal lamb disqualifies the uncircumcised, so the "of it" in respect to the offerings disqualifies the uncircumcised (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 8:1). 37,38

And he shall offer of it, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall offer of it" — one of each offering; "of it" — of the conjoined [loaves, i.e., all the loaves must be together at the time of the selection]; "one" — he must not take a broken one; "of each offering" — all of the offerings must be equal. He may not take [a greater portion] of one on behalf of the other (Menachoth 77b).^{39,40}

a gift-offering - I would not know of how many loaves to take; I, therefore, deduce it: It is stated here: "of it... as a gift-offering,," and, in respect to the gift-offering of the tithe (*Numbers* 18:28): "of it as a gift-offering." Just as there, one of ten, so, here, one of ten [loaves] (*Ibid.*).⁴¹

7:15 And the flesh of the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings, on the day of its offering it shall be eaten; he shall not leave of it until morning.

And the flesh - to include the exchange and the offspring of a substitute [for a thank-offering] in the law of being eaten only one day and one night (Zevachim 36b).⁴²

the sacrifice - to include a sin-offering and a guilt-offering in the law of being eaten only one day and one night (*Ibid.*).⁴³

the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings - From here we derive that it must be expressly slaughtered as a thank-offering (*Ibid.* 4a).⁴⁴

the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings - It was taught: Abba Chanin said in the name of R. Eliezer: "And the flesh of the sacrifice of his thanksgiving peace-offerings" — Scripture hereby teaches us that a

thank-offering slaughtered as a peace-offering is fit, whereas a peace-offering slaughtered as a thank-offering is unfit. How so? A thank-offering is referred to as a peace-offering, but a peace-offering is not referred to as a thank-offering (*Ibid.* 7a).⁴⁵

his thanksgiving peace-offerings - to include the peace-offerings of a Nazirite and those of Pesach in the law of being eaten only one day and one night (*Ibid.*).⁴⁶

on the day of its offering - to include the loaves of thanksgiving and the loaves and wafers of a Nazirite in the law of being eaten only one day and one night (*Ibid.*).⁴⁷

on the day of its offering it shall be eaten - followed by: "he shall not leave of it until morning," whence it is derived that in respect to sanctified offerings the night is reckoned as conjoined to the preceding day [and not, as to the succeeding one, as is generally the case] (Chullin 83a, see Rashi).48

until morning - And the Rabbis say: Until midnight, in order to keep one far from transgression. [But even so,] they are not invalidated by [the normally invalidating] thoughts, and there is no liability for nothar [left-overs] until the rise of the morning star (*Pesachim 71b*).⁴⁹

7:16 And if a vow or a gift is the sacrifice of his offering, on the day that he offers his sacrifice it shall be eaten; and on the next day, that which remains of it may be eaten.

And if a vow or a gift - to include the festive offering of the fourteenth day of Nissan for two days and one night of eating (*Pesachim* 71b).⁵⁰

on the day that he offers - It was taught: R. Yitzchak b. Avdimi said [Whence is it derived that blood on which the sun set before it was sprinkled is invalidated?] From: "on the day that he offers his sacrifice." On the day that you sacrifice [i.e., slaughter], you offer [i.e., sprinkle the blood]; on the day that you do not sacrifice, you do not offer (Zevachim 56a).⁵¹

on the day that he offers - It is a mitzvah to eat from it on the first day. I might think [it may be eaten only] one day; it is, therefore, written:

"and on the next day." If: "on the next day," I might think it is a mitzvah to eat it two days; it is, therefore, written: "that which remains" — if it remains, it remains (Torath Cohanim).

that which remains of it may be eaten - If: "that which remains," I might think that if he left all of it over, it would be invalid; it is, therefore, written: "may be eaten" — even all of it (*Ibid.*).

7:17 And what remains from the flesh of the sacrifice, on the third day, with fire it shall be burned.

And what remains from the flesh of the sacrifice - from the *flesh*; and not from the bones, and not from the sinews, and not from the horns, and not from the hooves. "The *sacrifice*" — to exclude the fœtus and the placenta (*Ibid.*). 52

on the third day, with fire it shall be burned - From here it is derived that *nothar* [what remains] is burned only in the daytime (*Zevachim* 56b).⁵³

on the third day, with fire it shall be burned - This is the prototype for all consecrated food that is burned being burned only in the daytime (*Torath Cohanim*).

7:18 And if there be eaten of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings on the third day, it shall not be accepted; he who offers it shall not bethink himself. It shall be rejected; and the soul that eats of it shall bear its sin.

And if there be eaten - The Rabbis taught: "And if there be eaten of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings on the third day" — R. Eliezer said: Incline your ear to hear: Scripture is speaking of one who thinks to eat of his sacrifice on the third day. But perhaps eating itself is being referred to! This cnnot be. After the offering has been validated [by the sprinkling of the blood], how can it become invalid! And if you ask: Let it become invalid retroactively, it is written: "he who offers it" — it becomes unfit at the time of offering, and not on the third day (Zevachim 29a). 54,55

And if there be eaten - It was taught: Others say ["And if there be eaten of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings on the third day" — Scripture is speaking of one who thinks to eat of his sacrifice on the third day. But perhps eating itself is being referred to!] — it is written: "he shall not bethink himself" — it is rendered unfit by thinking [piggul, at the time of the sacrifice], and not by [eating on] the third day (Ibid.). 56

And if there be eaten - It was taught: "I might think that thought [to eat of the offering on the third day] invalidated it only at the time of sprinkling. Whence do I derive that it is similarly invalidated by such thought at the time of slaughtering and receiving the blood? From: "And if there be eaten of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings on the third day" — Scripture is speaking of those things which lead to eating (*Ibid.* 13a).⁵⁷

And if there be eaten - It was taught: "And if there be eaten, eaten [lit.]...on the third day" — Scripture is referring to two eatings: one, the eating of man; the other, the "eating" of the altar" — to include the spilling of the left-over blood and the smoking of the devoted portions [on the altar after the prescribed time] in the category of invalidating thoughts. And this holds true only if he thinks: I am sprinkling in order to spill out the left-overs tomorrow [and not on that day, as prescribed; it does not apply, however, if he thinks to eat the meat on the third day, at the time that he spills the left-over blood or smokes the devoted portions. To be invalidating, the thought must occur during one of four services: slaughtering, sprinkling of the blood, receiving of the blood, and presenting of the blood] (*Ibid.* b). 58,59

And if there be eaten - It was taught: ["And if there be eaten, eaten... on the third day" — Scripture is referring to two eatings: one, the eating of man; the other the "eating" of the altar.] Why does Scripture refer to smoking as "eating"? To teach that it makes no difference whether he thinks [his invalidating thought] in terms of the "eating" of the altar or in terms of the "smoking" of the altar; and to teach that just as [invalidation in respect to] eating requires [thought pertaining to flesh] the size of an olive, so [invalidation in respect to] smoking requires such thought (Menachoth 17b). 60,61

of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings - [All sacrifices are

being compared to peace-offerings.] Just as with peace-offerings, there are [potential piggul] "rejectors" [i.e., those who offer them] and "rejectees" [the flesh and the devoted portions], so piggul [rejection] obtains with all offerings where there are rejectors and rejectees [to exclude the fistful, the frankincense, the incense, the meal-offering of the anointed priest, and the meal-offering of the libations, where nothing validates them, but they validate themselves] (Zevachim 28b).62

it shall not be accepted - [and in respect to a valid offering it is written (*Ibid.* 1:4): "and it shall be acceptable for him"] This teaches us that the acceptability of an invalid offering is likened to that of a valid one. Just as the acceptability of a valid offering comes at the end of all its validating services [with the service of sprinkling], so the acceptability of an invalid offering [i.e., the point at which it would have been acceptable had it not been invalidated by a thought of *piggul*] comes at the end of all its validating services [with the service of sprinkling, so that with that service the *piggul* takes effect, and he who eats of the flesh incurs the penalty of cutting-off; whereas, if the blood had not been sprinkled, the *piggul* would not take effect] (*Ibid.*).63

he who offers it - It was taught: Sprinkling was in the class of all the sacrificial services. Why was it singled out for special mention ["he who offers it" being understood as: he who sprinkles the blood]? To make it the basis for a comparison, viz., just as sprinkling is characterized by its being a sacrificial service upon which atonement is contingent, and a thought of piggul during it invalidates the offering, so, all sacrificial services upon which atonement is contingent invalidate the offering by an accompanying thought of piggul—to exclude the spilling of the left-over blood and the smoking of the devoted portions, which, atonement not being contingent upon them, do not invalidate the offering by an accompanying thought of piggul—this being so in an instance in which one says: "I am spilling-out the left-over blood in order to smoke the devoted portions tomorrow" [and not on the same day, as prescribed] (Ibid. 13b).64

he who offers it - Scripture here speaks of the unfitness of the offering and not of that of the officiating priest (*Ibid.*).⁶⁵

he who offers it - It was taught: Ben Azzai says: What is the intent of "it"? Because it is written (*Deuteronomy* 23:22): "Do not delay paying

it" [a vow], I might think that one who delays his vow, too [just as one who delays the eating of his offering beyond the prescribed time] falls under: "it shall not be accepted" [so that, if delayed, the vow cannot be made good]; it is, therefore, written: "it" — "it" is subject to non-acceptance, but not a delayed vow (*Ibid.* 29a).66

he shall not bethink himself - R. Yannai said: Whence is it derived that thoughts "undo" each other? From: "he shall not bethink" — Other thoughts shall not be intertwined with the thought of piggul [i.e., a thought of psul (unfitness, e.g., thinking to eat the offering outside the prescribed place) "undoes" a preceding thought of piggul (thinking to eat the offering after the prescribed time, so that in such an instance the offering is considered posul (unfit) and not piggul (rejected)] (Ibid. b).⁶⁷

It shall be rejected - If he thought to sprinkle the blood the next day [piggul], not in its prescribed place [posul], it remains posul [unfit for eating], but not piggul [rejected as a sacrifice]. Why so? For it is written: "It shall be piggul" ["rejected"] — to exclude an offering whose disqualifying factor is not [entirely] piggul, but something else (Ibid. 27a).68

It shall be rejected - "On the third day" — after its time; "rejected" — outside of its place; "it shall be" — this teaches us that they [i.e., thoughts to eat it after its time and outside of its place] combine with each other [in an instance where he thinks to eat half the size of an olive after its time, and half the size of an olive outside of its place] to render the offering posul [unfit] (Ibid. 29a).69

and the soul that eats of it - one, and not two [i.e., the punishment of cutting-off attaches to only one type of piggul, and not to two.] To which type does it apply? "After its time," but not "outside of its place." Why so? It is derived "sin" [here: "the soul that eats of it shall bear its sin"] - "sin" from nothar [left-over] (Ibid. 19:8): "And everyone who eats of it shall bear his sin"], to which it is similar in respect to time [i.e., a time restriction (as opposed to a place restriction)] and in respect to bamah [both nothar and time-piggul aplying to bamah, (a temporary altar) — as opposed to place-piggul, which does not apply there. For this reason, it is only time-piggul which is linked with the cutting-off stated in respect to nothar, and not place-piggul] (Ibid.).⁷⁰

it shall bear its sin - The sanctified offerings of gentiles are not subject to piggul liability. Why so? It is derived: "sin" - "sin" from nothar, it being stated [here] in respect to piggul: "it shall bear its sin," and, in respect to nothar (Ibid. 19:8): "And everyone who eats of it shall bear his sin"; just as the sanctified offerings of gentiles are not subject to nothar liability, so they are not subject to piggul liability (Temurah 3a).⁷¹

it shall bear its sin - [Which sin does he bear?] Zavda b. Levi taught: It is written further (*Ibid.* 19:8): "And everyone who eats of it shall bear his sin ... and that soul shall be cut off," and here: "it shall bear its sin"; just as there, the punishment is cutting-off, here, too, the punishment is cutting-off (*Krituth* 5a).⁷²

7:19 And the flesh that shall touch any unclean thing shall not be eaten. It shall be burned with fire. And the flesh — everyone that is clean may eat flesh.

And the flesh - "And the flesh" — to include wood and frankincense [as susceptible to uncleanliness] (*Pesachim* 24a).⁷³

And the flesh that shall touch - The Rabbis taught: Whence is third-degree uncleanliness in respect to sanctified objects derived in Scripture? From: "And the flesh that shall touch any unclean thing." Are we not speaking of its touching second-degree uncleanliness [this being referred to elsewhere as "an unclean thing"], and Scripture goes on to state: "it shall not be eaten" [implying that it has acquired third-degree uncleanliness] (Chagigah 24a).²⁴

And the flesh that shall touch - "that shall touch" — of a certainty, but if there is a doubt as to its uncleanliness or cleanliness, it may be eaten. But look further on: "And the flesh — everyone that is clean may eat flesh" — one who is clean of a certainty, may eat flesh, but if there is a doubt as to his cleanliness or uncleanliness it may not be eaten! How can this be? Here [in respect to the cleanliness or uncleanliness of the person] he has the mind to ask [i.e., to ascertain his state of cleanliness or uncleanliness, so that doubt is not permitted]; there [in respect to the cleanliness or uncleanliness of the object touched by the flesh], there is no "mind which can ask" (Sotah 29a).75

And the flesh that shall touch - [One in a state of cleanliness who ate unclean sanctified flesh before the sprinkling of the blood does not receive stripes] for it is written: "And the flesh that shall touch any unclean thing shall not be eaten," followed by (20): "And the soul which eats flesh of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, which is the L-rd's, and his uncleanliness is upon him, that soul shall be cut off from its people"; and since: "and his cleanliness is upon him, that soul shall be cut off" does not apply [before the sprinkling of the blood], so: "And the flesh that shall touch any unclean thing shall not be eaten" does not apply (Zevachim 34a). 16

shall not be eaten - What is the intent of this? If it is not needed for itself [for, certainly, if it is to be burned, it is not to be eaten], then learn it as applying to all the prohibitions [of eating] in the Torah; and if it is not needed for [the prohibition against] eating, learn it as applying to the derivation of benefit [so that wherever eating is prohibited, we may assume the derivation of benefit to be similarly prohibited] (*Pesachim* 24a).

and the flesh — everyone that is clean - "and the flesh" — to include the devoted portions (*Ibid.* b). 78

everyone that is clean - The Rabbis taught: Men and women with genital discharges, menstruating women and those who have given birth — who ate of a Paschal offering in a state of uncleanliness — I might think they are liable; it is, therefore, written: "everyone that is clean may eat flesh. And the soul which eats flesh of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings ... and his uncleanliness is upon him, that soul shall be cut off" — What may be eaten by the clean causes liability for uncleanliness; what may not be eaten by the clean does not cause liability for uncleanliness (*Ibid.* 95b).⁷⁹

everyone that is clean - It was taught: I might think that flesh which became unclean before the sprinkling of the blood would cause liability for uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "everyone that is clean may eat flesh. And the soul which eats flesh of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, which is the L-rd's, and his uncleanliness is upon him, that soul shall be cut off" — What is permitted to the clean causes liability for uncleanliness; what is not permitted to the clean does not cause liability for uncleanliness (Menachoth 25).80

7:20 And the soul which eats flesh of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, which is the L-rd's, and his uncleanliness is upon him, that soul shall be cut off from its people.

of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings - Were not peace-offerings in the class of all that is sanctified? Why were they singled out for special mention? To serve as the basis for a comparison, viz., just as peace-offerings are sanctified unto the altar, so, all that are sanctified unto the altar cause [uncleanliness] liability — to exclude what is sanctified for Temple maintenance (Krituth 2b).81

which is the L-rd's - to include the devoted portions of lower-order offerings as causing uncleanliness liability (Zevachim 36b).⁸²

which is the L-rd's - to include flesh that "rested [beyond its prescribed time for eating] and that was taken out [of the Temple precincts] as causing uncleanliness liability. I might think that piggul, too, is to be included; it is, therefore, written: "of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings" — to exclude [piggul] (Menachoth 25b).83

and his uncleanliness is upon him - It was said: Whence is derived the exhortation against eating sanctified flesh [in a state of uncleanliness]? R. Yochanan said: It is written here: "and his uncleanliness is upon him," and [in respect to uncleanliness] in entering the sanctuary (Numbers 19:13): "he shall be unclean; his uncleanliness is yet upon him"; just as there, there is punishment and exhortation, here, too, there is punishment and exhortation (Zevachim 33b).84

and his uncleanliness is upon him - Scripture here speaks of [the man's] bodily uncleanliness. But perhaps the uncleanliness of the [animal's] flesh is being spoken of! I deduce it: It is written here: "his uncleanliness is upon him," and, in respect to [uncleanliness in] entering the sanctuary (Numbers 19:13): "his uncleanliness is yet upon him." Just as there, bodily uncleanliness is being referred to, so here, bodily uncleanliness is being referred to (Ibid. 43b).85

and his uncleanliness is upon him - It was taught: R. Yossi says: It is not written: "and their [the peace-offerings'] uncleanliness is upon them," but: "and his uncleanliness is upon him" — this teaches us that

bodily uncleanliness is being spoken of, and not the uncleanliness of the flesh (*Ibid.*).⁸⁶

and his uncleanliness is upon him - It was taught: Others say: Scripture here speaks of bodily uncleanliness, and not of the uncleanliness of the flesh. How is this seen? For it is written: "and his uncleanliness is upon him" — one from whom uncleanliness can "fly" [i.e., one who can cleanse himself of his uncleanliness] — to exclude flesh, from which uncleanliness cannot fly (*Ibid.*).87

and his uncleanliness is upon him - It was taught: Rebbi says: (21): "and he eat" — the verse [here, as there,] speaks of bodily uncleanliness, and not of the uncleanliness of the flesh. How is this seen? R. Yitzchak b. Avudimi says: Since the verse [here] opens in the feminine and concludes in the feminine, with the masculine in the middle, it follows [just as it is obvious in the next verse, where the order is the same,] that Scripture is speaking of bodily uncleanliness (*Ibid.* 43b). 88

and his uncleanliness is upon him - One who eats sanctified food after having immersed, before the set of sun [when he would acquire complete cleanliness] or before he brings his atonement, receives stripes, but does not incur the punishment of cutting-off, for it is written: "and his uncleanliness is upon him" — while all his uncleanliness is upon him (Rambam, Pesulei Hamukdashim 18:14).

that soul shall be cut off from its people - "the soul" [i.e., the individual], and not the populace; "that soul" — and not one who sinned through accident, unwittingness, or error; "from its people" — the people remain unharmed [by his ignoral of their admonitions] (Torath Cohanim). 90-92

7:21 And if a soul touch any unclean thing, of the uncleanliness of a man or of an unclean beast, or of any unclean abomination, and he eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, which is the L-rd's, then that soul shall be cut off from its people.

then that soul shall be cut off - It was taught: R. Avahu said: The three

"cutting-offs" mentioned in respect to peace-offerings — why were they stated? One (*Ibid.* 22:3) for the general rule [of cutting-off for defiling what is sanctified]; one (20) for the specific qualification [to include only what is sanctified for the altar, and not what is sanctified for Temple maintenance], and one [here] to include things that are not eaten [such as incense and frankincense, in the stricture of bodily uncleanliness] (*Shevuoth* 7a).93

- 7:22 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying:
- 7:23 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: all fats of ox or sheep or goat you shall not eat.

all fats - I might think that only what is included in the punishment [of cutting-off] is included in the exhortation [against eating], but the fats of a koi [an animal whose status — domesticated (whose fats are forbidden) or undomesticated (whose fats are permitted) — is in doubt], or half the prescribed amount [for incurring the punishment of cutting-off] — I might think that since they are not included in the punishment they are not included in the exhortation; it is therefore, written: "all fats" (Yoma 74a).94

all fats - "all" — to include the fats of an ox that has been stoned and of the heifer of the broken neck (*Deuteronomy* 21:1-9), which, though benefit may not be derived from them, are not subject to neveilah [carcass] uncleanliness [it being stated in the next verse: "may be used for all labor"] (*Zevachim* 70b). 95

ox or sheep or goat - that which is common to ox, sheep, and goat — to exclude the fat-tail, which is absent in an ox (Chullin 117a). 96

ox or sheep or goat - [the fats] of ox or sheep or goat are forbidden, but those of undomesticated animals and birds are permitted (Krituth 4a). 97

you shall not eat - The Rabbis taught: If one ate the fats of a neveilah [an animal that died of itself] or the fats of a sanctified animal, he receives stripes twice [and not three times]; and though it is written (*Ibid.* 3:17): "All fats you shall not eat", "all fats of ox or sheep or goat

you shall not eat," and (*Ibid.* 22:10): "And no stranger shall eat sanctified food" [so that we might think that in the latter instance he receives stripes three times], the Rabbis hold that: "all fats of ox or sheep or goat you shall not eat" is stated in respect to non-sanctified food (*Ibid.* b). 98,99

7:24 And the fats of a *neveilah* and the fats of a *treifah* [an animal which is "torn"] may be used for all labor, but you shall not eat it.

And the fats of a neveilah - The Rabbis taught: Scripture is speaking of the fats of a clean animal. But perhaps it is the fats of an unclean animal! [This cannot be, for] it is written: "and the fats of a treifah" — what is forbidden on the grounds of treifah [organic defect], to exclude an unclean animal, which is not forbidden on the grounds of treifah [but on those of uncleanliness] (Zevachim 70b). 100,101

and the fats of a treifah - It was taught: R. Yehudah said: Why is "treifah" mentioned? If a treifah is [considered to be] living, neveilah is already stated [i.e., when the treifah dies, it becomes a neveilah, and is forbidden because of that]; if a treifah is not [considered to be] living, then it is already in the category of neveilah! It is needed to indicate the superimposition of the prohibition of treifah upon that of forbidden fats (Ibid. 69b, 70a). 102,103

may be used for all labor - What is the intent of: "for all labor"? to include permission for profane [non-sanctified] labor, and to include [its being considered in a state of] cleanliness [unlike the flesh of neveilah, which is unclean,] for sacred service (Pesachim 23a).¹⁰⁴

but you shall not eat it - [The fats of a non-domesticated animal which died (i.e., neveilah) cause uncleanliness as does the flesh of a neveilah] Why so? It is written: "And the fats of a neveilah and the fats of a treifah may be used for all labor, but you shall not eat it" — [the neveilah fat of] that [kind of animal may be used for all labor (not causing uncleanliness)] whose fat is forbidden and whose flesh is permitted — to exclude [the neveilah fat of] a non-domesticated animal, whose fat and flesh are permitted (Zevachim 70b).¹⁰⁵

but you shall not eat it - Why state this? [We already know that fats are not to be eaten.] Rava said: Scripture is saying: Let the prohibition of neveilah come and superimpose itself upon that of fats; and let the prohibition of treifah come and superimpose itself on that of fats (Chullin 37a). 106

you shall not eat it - You shall not eat it, but you may give it to others [gentiles] to eat (Torath Cohanim).¹⁰⁷

7:25 For all who eat fats of the beast, of which one presents a fire-offering to the L-rd, the soul that eats shall be cut off from its people.

of which one presents - From here I derive [the rule] only in relation to the fats of whole animals, that are fit for sacrifice. Whence do I derive it for the fats of animals with blemishes? From: "of the beast." Whence do I derive it for non-sanctified fats? From: "For all who eat fats." If so, why is it written: "of which one presents"? Fats of the kind that are fit to be presented (Torath Cohanim). 108-110

the soul that eats shall be cut off - If one dissolved the fats and drank them, he is liable. But is not "eating" mentioned here? Resh Lakish said: The verse states: "the soul" — to include drinking [which satisfies the soul] (Chullin 120a). 111

the soul that eats - "that eats," and not that causes [another] to eat; "that eats" — the size of an olive (Torath Cohanim). 112,113

7:26 And all blood you shall not eat, in all of your habitations, of bird and of beast.

of bird and of beast - The Rabbis taught: "And all blood you shall not eat." This would seem to include even the blood of bipeds [men], the blood of eggs, the blood of grasshoppers, the blood of fish; it is, therefore, written: "of bird and of beast." Just as bird and beast are characterized by being subject to minor uncleanliness [the uncleanliness of food, the size of an egg] and major uncleanliness [that of neveilah, uncleanliness acquired through carrying the size of an olive]; and by

states of prohibition [before slaughtering] and permission [after slaughtering]; and by being of the class of meat — so, all that are subject to minor uncleanliness — to exclude the blood of biped, which are not subject to minor uncleanliness; to exclude the blood of reptiles, which are not subject to major uncleanliness; to exclude the blood of eggs, which are not of the class of meat; to exclude the blood of fish and grasshoppers, which are always in a state of permission (Krituth 20b). 114-120

of bird and of beast — I might think [if only "bird" were stated], just as a bird, which is not subject to kilaim [the law against admixture], so, a beast which is not subject to kilaim [comes under the stricture of forbidden blood — to exclude sheep, which are subject to kilaim (by way of their wool)]; it is, therefore, written: "and of beast." And if only "beast" were stated, [I might think] just as a beast, which is not subject to the law against taking the mother together with the young, so, a bird which is not subject to that law [(i.e., an unclean bird) comes under the stricture of forbidden blood, but not a clean bird]; it is, therefore, written: "of bird" (Ibid. 21a). 121

- 7:27 Any soul that eats any blood, that soul shall be cut off from its people.
- 7:28 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 7:29 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: He who presents the sacrifice of his peace-offerings to the L-rd shall bring his offering to the L-rd from the sacrifice of his peace-offerings.

Speak to the children of Israel - The children of Israel "lift" (30) but idolators [who present an offering] do not lift; the [lit.] sons of Israel lift, but the daughters of Israel do not lift (Menachoth 61b). 122,123

Speak to the children of Israel - This indicates only the children of Israel. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in "lifting"] proselytes and freed servants? From: "He who presents." But perhpas this refers to the

officiating priest! It is, therefore, written (30): "His hands shall bring," the owner of the offering obviously being intended (*Ibid.*). 124,125

7:30 His hands shall bring the fire-offerings of the L-rd; the fat with the breast shall he bring it. The breast, to lift it, a lifting before the L-rd.

His hands shall bring - It is written here: "His hands shall bring," and, elsewhere (*Deuteronomy* 26:4).: "And the priest shall take the basket from your hand." Just as there, the priest [participates], here, too, the priest; and just as there, the owner, here, too, the owner. How is this effected? The priest places his hand under that of the owner and lifts (*Ibid.*).¹²⁶

shall he bring it - [Who brings it?] — the priest, from the store-room (*Ibid.* 62a).¹²⁷

The breast - The Rabbis taught: What is the "breast"? What "sees the ground" [i.e., the lower fats]: downwards, until the neck; upwards, until the stomach. He cuts two ribs from two walls, to either side; and this is the breast which is given to the priests (Chullin 45a). 128,129

The breast, etc. - If all of the devoted portions became unclean, and only one remained, whence is it derived that it requires lifting? From: "The breast, to lift it" — even one kidney (*Torath Cohanim*).

- a lifting "a lifting," and not liftings (Ibid.).
- 7:31 And the priest shall cause the fat to smoke upon the altar; and the breast shall be for Aaron and for his sons.

and the breast shall be - It was taught: I might think that the priests acquire the breast and thigh before the smoking of the devoted portions; it is, therefore, written: "And the priest shall cause the fat to smoke upon the altar," and then: "and the breast shall be for Aaron and for his sons" (Pesachim 59b). 130

for Aaron and for his sons - It was taught: I might think that if the devoted portions became unclean or were lost, the priests would not

acquire the breast and thigh; it is, therefore, written: "and the breast shall be for Aaron and for his sons" — in any event (*Ibid.*).¹³¹

7:32 And the right thigh you shall give as an offering to the priest, from the sacrifices of your peace-offerings.

And the right thigh - This teaches me only "the right thigh." Whence do I derive the shoulder of the offering [of the Nazirite, as being the right shoulder]? From: "an offering." Whence do I derive the non-sacred shoulder [i.e., that given to the priest as a gift from an animal that is not an offering, as being the right shoulder]? From: "you shall give" (Chullin 134b). 132

7:33 He who offers the blood of the peace-offerings and the fat, of the sons of Aaron, to him shall be the right thigh as a portion.

He who offers, etc. - "He who offers the blood of the peace-offerings"

— From here it is derived that the receiving of the blood must be specifically intended for the peace-offering (Zevachim 4a).¹³³

He who offers, etc. - Any priest that is not qualified to officiate does not share in the flesh — even if he is unclean at the time of the sprinkling of the blood and clean at the time of the smoking of the fats. For it is written: "He who offers the blood of the peace-offerings and the fat, of the sons of Aaron, to him shall be the right thigh as a portion" (*Ibid.* 98b). 134

and the fat - It was taught: Abba Shaul says: He does not eat unless he is clean from the time of sprinkling until the time of the smoking of the fats. [If he is clean at both of those times, but unclean in between, he does not eat], for it is written: "He who offers the blood of the peace-offerings and the fat," even the smoking of the fats coming under this stricture (*Ibid.* 102b). 135

of the sons of Aaron - It was taught: R. Shimon says: Any priest who does not acknowledge the priestly service [as having been commanded by the L-rd] has no share in the priesthood, as it is written: "He who

offers the blood of the peace-offerings and the fat, of the sons of Aaron, to him shall be the right thigh as a portion"— If he acknowledges the priestly service, he has a share in the priesthood; if he does not acknowledge the priestly service, he has no share in the poriesthood (*Menachoth* 18b). 136,137

7:34 For the breast of the lifting and the thigh of the offering I have taken from the children of Israel from the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and I have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, as an everlasting statute, from the children of Israel.

and I have given them - The priestly gifts — the shoulder and the cheeks and the maw — obtain with non-sanctified animals, but not with sanctified ones, for it is written: "and I have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, as an everlasting statute, from the children of Israel." They receive only what is stated in that regard (Chullin 130a). 138

and I have given them - These priestly gifts never revert [to the givers], for it is written: "and I have given them" — Just as a gift does not revert [to the giver], so these do not (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 8:1). 139

7:35 This is the anointing of Aaron and the anointing of his sons from the fire-offerings of the L-rd on the day He presented them to be priests to the L-rd.

This is the anointing of Aaron - It was taught: R. Yehudah says: I might think that Aaron and his sons would require the anointing oil in time to come; it is, therefore, written: "This is the anointing of Aaron and the anointing of his sons" (Torath Cohanim).¹⁴⁰

- 7:36 Which the L-rd commanded to give them on the day when He anointed them, from the children of Israel, a statute forever, throughout their generations.
- 7:37 This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the meal-offering,

and of the sin-offering, and of the guilt-offering, and of the consecration-offering, and of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings.

This is the law - Rava said: That which is written: "This is the law of the burnt-offering, etc." — All who occupy themselves with Torah require neither burnt-offering, nor meal-offering, nor sin-offering, nor guilt-offering (Menachoth 101a). 141

of the burnt-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a burnt-offering. Just as a burnt-offering requires an instrument for slaughtering, so do all offerings require an instrument for slaughtering. Which instrument? A knife (Zevachim 97b). 142,143

of the meal-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a meal-offering. Just as a meal-offering is eaten only by the males of the priesthood and sanctifies [food with which it comes in contact] via absorption, so all of the offerings are eaten only by the males of the priesthood and sanctify via absorption (*Ibid.*). 144,145

and of the sin-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a sin-offering. Just as a sin-offering comes only from what is unconsecrated, is processed by the right hand, and sanctifies via absorption, so all of the offerings come only from what is unconsecrated, are processed by the right hand, and sanctify via absorption (*Ibid.* 98a). 146,147

and of the guilt-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a guilt-offering. Just as in a guilt-offering, the fœtus and the placenta are not sanctified [guilt-offerings coming only from male animals] and its bones are permitted [for the making of utensils], so in all offerings, the fœtus and the placenta are not sanctified, and the bones are permitted (*Ibid.*). 148,149

and of the consecration-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a consecration-offering. Just as in a consecration-offering, the left-overs are burned, and "there are no live animals in their left-overs" [i.e., there are no substitutes for consecration-offerings that go lost], so with all offerings, their left-overs are burned, and their living "left-overs" [i.e., substitutes,] are not burned (*Ibid.*). 150,151

and of the consecration-offering - All of the offerings are likened to a consecration-offering. Just as with a consecration-offering, all of its rules and details were pronounced at Sinai, so with all offerings, all of their rules and details were pronounced at Sinai (*Torath Cohanim*). 152,153

and of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings - All of the offerings are likened to peace-offerings. Just as with peace-offerings, there is a stricutre of express intent, both as regards change of offering and change of owner [i.e., the sacrifice must be expressly intended as a peace-offering, and for its specific owner], so with all offerings, there is a stricture of express intent, both as regards change of offering and change of owner [i.e., the sactifice must be expressly intended as a peace-offering, and for its specific owner], so with all offerings, there is a stricture of express intent, both as regards change of offering and change of owner (Zevachim 4b). 154,155

and of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings - All of the offerings are likened to peace-offerings. Just as with peace-offerings, there are "rejectors [the offerers, in the event of a thought of piggul] and "rejectees" [the flesh and the devoted portions in the above instance], so with all offerings, there are rejectors and rejectees (*Ibid.* 98a). 156,157

7:38 Which the L-rd commanded Moses in Mount Sinai on the day that He commanded the children of Israel to present their offerings to the L-rd in the desert of Sinai.

on the day that He commanded - From here it is derived that sacrifices are offered in the daytime and not at night (*Ibid.*).¹⁵⁸

on the day that He commanded - The entire day is acceptable for "pinching," the fistful, [receiving of the blood,] smoking, and sprinkling; for it is written: "on the day that He commanded" (Megillah 20b). 159

- 8:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 8:2 Take Aaron, and his sons with him, and the garments, and

the oil of anointment, and the bullock of the sin-offering, and the two rams, and the basket of unleavened bread.

Take Aaron - It was taught: Why is the section on offerings juxtaposed with that of the priestly garments? To teach that just as offerings atone, so the priestly garments atone (Zevachim 88b).

8:3 And all of the congregation assemble at the door of the tent of meeting.

all of the congregation assemble - in the presence of the entire congregation, so that the priesthood would come to be venerated (Torath Cohanim).²

8:4 And Moses did as the L-rd commanded him, and the congregation was assembled at the door of the tent of meeting.

at [lit., "to"] the door of the tent of meeting - The leader of the assembly stood facing the sanctuary, and all the people stood facing the sanctuary, as it is written: "And the congregation was assembled to the door of the tent of meeting" [Moses, being analogous, in this instance, to the leader of the assembly] (Tosefta Megillah 3).³

8:5 And Moses said to the congregation: This is the thing which the L-rd has commanded to do.

This is the thing - It was taught: R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Shimon b. Yochai: Whence is it derived that even the reading of the section [of the consecration] is essential [to the consecration itself]? From: "And Moses said: This is the thing [lit., "word"] which the L-rd has commanded" — even speech is an indispensable element [for the validity of the consecration] (Yoma 5b).

8:6 And Moses drew near Aaron and his sons and he washed them with water.

8:7 And he put upon him the tunic, and he girded him with the girdle, and he clothed him with the robe, and he put upon him the ephod, and he girded him with the band of the ephod, and he bound him with it.

And he girded him with the girdle - And in the command [relating to the priestly garments] it is written (Exodus 29:9): "And you shall gird them with the girdle" [implying that father and son, respectively, are first clothed up to the point of the girdle, after which the girdle is placed, successively, on each — whereas here it is indicated that first the father is fully clothed, after which the clothing of the sons is begun]. How can this be reconciled? The truth is that Aaron is clothed before his sons. How is: "And you shall gird them" to be understood? As implying that the girdle of the high priest and that of the ordinary priest is the same [i.e., they are both made of kilaim (flax and wool)] (Ibid. 6a). 5,6

- 8:8 And he placed upon him the breastplate, and he put in the breastplate the Urim and the Tumim.
- 8:9 And he set the mitre upon his head; and he set upon the mitre, upon its forefront, the golden plate, the holy crown, as the L-rd commanded Moses.
- 8:10 And Moses took the oil of anointment and he anointed the tabernacle and all that was therein, and he sanctified them.
- 8:11 And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times; and he anointed the altar with all of its vessels, and the laver and its base, to sanctify them.
- 8:12 And he poured from the oil of anointment upon the head of Aaron, and he anointed him to sanctify him.

And he poured from the oil, etc. - It was taught: First he pours oil upon his head, and then he places oil between the lids of his eyes (*Krituth* 5b).

- 8:13 And Moses brought the sons of Aaron, and he clothed them with tunics, and he girded them with girdles, and he bound them with turbans, as the L-rd commanded Moses.
- 8:14 And he brought the bullock of the sin-offering, and Aaron and his sons placed their hands on the head of the bullock of the sin-offering.
- 8:15 And it was slaughtered, and Moses took the blood, and he put it upon the corners of the altar, roundabout, with his finger, and he purified the altar; and he poured out the blood at the foundation of the altar, and he sanctified it to make atonement upon it.

And it was slaughtered, and Moses took - All of the seven days of consecration, Moses officiated in the high-priesthood, the Holy One Blessed be He having said to Moses: You serve Me until Aaron learns. For this reason it is written: "And it was slaughtered, and Moses took the blood, etc." (Torath Cohanim).

- 8:16 And he took all the fat that was upon the innards, and the lobe of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and Moses caused it to smoke upon the altar.
- 8:17 And the bullock, with its skin, and its flesh, and its dung, he burned with fire outside the camp, as the L-rd commanded Moses.
- 8:18 And he presented the ram of the burnt-offering, and

Aaron and his sons placed their hands upon the head of the ram.

- 8:19 And it was slaughtered, and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar roundabout.
- 8:20 And the ram was cut into its pieces, and Moses caused to smoke the head, and the pieces, and the suet.
- 8:21 And the innards and the legs he washed with water, and Moses caused the whole ram to smoke upon the altar. It is a burnt-offering, for a sweet savor, a fire-offering to the L-rd, as the L-rd commanded Moses.
- 8:22 And he presented the second ram, the ram of consecration; and Aaron and his sons placed their heads on the head of the ram.
- 8:23 And it was slaughtered, and Moses took of its blood and placed it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the thumb of his right foot.
- 8:24 And Moses brought forward Aaron's sons, and Moses put of the blood upon the tip of their right ear, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the thumb of their right foot; and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar roundabout.
- 8:25 And he took the fat, and the tail, and all the fat that was

upon the innards, and the lobe of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right thigh.

8:26 And from the basket of unleavened bread which was before the L-rd, he took one unleavened cake, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer, and he placed them upon the fats and upon the right thigh.

and he placed them upon the fats - It was taught: How is the *mitzvah* of "lifting" executed? He places the devoted portions on the palm of the hand and the breast and thigh upon them; and wherever there is bread, the bread goes on top. And where is this to be found? R. Pappa said: In the consecration-offering [as it is written: "And from the basket of unleavened bread ... he took one unleavened cake, and one cake of oiled bread ... and he placed them on the fats"] ((Menachoth 62a).8,9

8:27 And he put all of it upon the hands of Aaron and upon the hands of his sons, and he lifted them, a lifting before the L-rd.

upon the hands of Aaron - Now are all of the offerings placed into the hands of the owners [where there are partners in the offering, as Aaron and his sons are partners in this offering. Did we not learn that in such a case one lifts on behalf of all?] It rather comes to teach us how the draught is administered to the *sotah* [a woman accused of infidelity, the priest placing his hand beneath hers in lifting the offering, after the manner indicated here], and how lepers are cleansed [the log of oil in that instance being lifted by the priest himself, as, in this instance, Moses lifts the breast himself] (*Torath Cohanim*). 10,11

8:28 And Moses took them from off their hands, and he caused them to smoke upon the altar, upon the burnt-offering; they are a consecration-offering, for a sweet savor. It is a fire-offering to the L-rd.

8:29 And Moses took the breast and lifted it, a lifting before the L-rd, from the ram of the consecration. To Moses it was for a portion, as the L-rd commanded Moses.

To Moses it was for a portion - Rav said: Moses our teacher was a highpriest, and he shared in the sanctified offerings of Heaven, as it is written: "from the ram of the consecration. To Moses it was for a portion" (Zevachim 101b).¹²

- 8:30 And Moses took of the oil of anointment and of the blood which was upon the altar, and he sprinkled it upon Aaron, upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him. And he sanctified Aaron, his garments, and his sons, and the garments of his sons with him.
- 8:31 And Moses said to Aaron and his sons: Cook the flesh at the door of the tent of meeting, and there eat it and the bread that is in the basket of consecration, as I have commanded saying: Aaron and his sons shall eat it.

and there eat it - It was taught: If chambers were built in a non-sanctified area and opened into the sanctified area, priests were permitted to enter there and eat of the higher-order offerings. And as to its being written: "Cook the flesh at the door of the tent of meeting and there eat it" — the offerings of that particular occasion were different (*Ibid.* 56a). 13,14

- 8:32 And that which is left over of the flesh and of the bread, you shall burn with fire.
- 8:33 And from the door of the tent of meeting you shall not go out seven days, until the day of the fulfillment of the days of your consecration; for seven days He shall consecrate your hands.

8:34 As He did on this day, the L-rd has commanded to do, to make atonement for you.

to do, to make atonement - Seven days before the Day of Atonement the high priest is separated from his home [so as not to risk niddah uncleanliness]; similarly, seven days before the burning of the red heifer, the priest who is to burn it is separated from his home. Whence is this derived? From: "As He did on this day, the L-rd has commanded to do, to make atonement for you": "to do" — this alludes to the procedure with respect to the red heifer; "to make atonement" — this alludes to the procedure with respect to the Day of Atonement (Yoma 2a). 15,16

8:35 And at the door of the tent of meeting you shall sit day and night, seven days; and you shall watch the watching of the L-rd, and you shall not die, for thus have I been commanded

seven days - It was taught: Where is the seven-day mourning period alluded to in the Torah? R. Yaakov in the name of R. Zeira said: In: "And at the door of the tent of meeting you shall sit day and night, seven days; and you shall watch the watching of the L-rd." Just as the Holy One Blessed be He watches over His world seven days, so you watch over your brothers seven days (Yerushalmi Moed Katan 3:4).¹⁷

and you shall watch, etc. - It was taught: R. Yochanan said: Everything mentioned in respect to the consecration-offering is indispensable to it [i.e., omission of even one element invalidates the whole]. Why so? R. Mesharshiya said: "and you shall watch the watching of the L-rd"—this connotes limitation [i.e., insistence on every prescribed element]. R. Ashi said: "for thus have I been commanded"— this connotes limitation (Ibid. 5b). 18,19

8:36 And Aaron and his sons did all of the things that the L-rd commanded by the hand of Moses.

Shemini

9:1 And it was on the eighth day that Moses called to Aaron and to his sons and to the elders of Israel.

And it was on the eighth day - It was taught: That day [of the erection of the tabernacle] was as joyous to the Holy One Blessed be He as the day of the creation of heaven and earth, it being written here: "And it was on the eighth day," and there (Genesis): "And it was evening and it was morning" (Megillah 10b).

on the eighth day - We do not know [from this] whether the eighth day of the number [of the days of consecration] or the eighth day of the month is being referred to. From (*Ibid.* 8:33): "for seven days He shall consecrate your hands" we deduce that it is the seventh day of the number (*Torath Cohanim*).²

9:2 And he said to Aaron: Take for yourself a bull-calf for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering, without blemish, and offer them before the L-rd.

Take for yourself a bull-calf - Let us look into this. It is written (3): "And to the children of Israel you shall speak, saying: Take a he-goat for a sin-offering, and a calf" ["for yourself" not being written here]. Why, then, do we have: "Take for yourself a bull-calf here"? "For yourself" must imply, then, "of your own" [and not communal property] (Yoma 3b).3

a bull-calf - [From here we derive that a calf is in the category of an ox (this has certain halachic implications)] (Yerushalmi Nazir 5:1).4

9:3 And to the children of Israel you shall speak, saying: Take

a he-goat for a sin-offering and a calf and a lamb one year old, without blemish, for a burnt-offering.

9:4 And an ox and a ram for peace-offerings to sacrifice before the L-rd, and a meal-offering mixed with oil, for today the L-rd will appear to you.

for today the L-rd will appear - It was taught: All of the seven days of consecration Moses officiated in the high-priesthood, but the Shechinah did not come to repose through him; however, when Aaron donned the priestly vestments and officiated, the Shechinah came to repose through him. Whence is this derived? From: "for today the L-rd will appear to you" (Yerushalmi Yoma 1:1).5

- 9:5 And they brought what Moses had commanded in front of the tent of meeting, and all the congregation drew near and stood before the L-rd.
- 9:6 And Moses said: This is the thing which the L-rd commanded that you should do, so that there appear to you the glory of the L-rd.
- 9:7 And Moses said to Aaron: Draw near to the altar and offer your sin-offering and your burnt-offering, and make atonement for yourself and for the people; and present the offering of the people and make atonement for them, as the L-rd commanded.
- 9:8 And Aaron drew near to the altar and slaughtered the calf of the sin-offering, which was his.
- 9:9 And the sons of Aaron presented the blood to him, and he dipped his finger in the blood, and he put it on the corners

- of the altar; and he poured out the blood at the foundation of the altar.
- 9:10 And the fat and the kidneys and the lobe of the liver of the sin-offering he caused to smoke upon the altar, as the L-rd had commanded Moses.
- 9:11 And the flesh and the skin he burned with fire outside the camp.
- 9:12 And he slaughtered the burnt-offering, and Aaron's sons presented the blood to him, and he sprinkled it upon the altar roundabout.
- 9:13 And the burnt-offering they presented to him with its pieces and the head, and he caused them to smoke upon the altar.
- 9:14 And he washed the innards and the legs, and he caused them to smoke upon the altar.
- 9:15 And he presented the offering of the people, and he took the goat of the sin-offering which was the people's, and he slaughtered it, and offered it as a sin-offering, as the first.

and offered it as a sin-offering, as the first - Just as the first required processing of the blood for a sin-offering and sprinkling on the four corners, so this one required processing and sprinkling on the four corners (*Torath Cohanim*).⁶

9:16 And he presented the burnt-offering, and he offered it according to the ordinance.

and he offered it according to the ordinance - according to the ordinance of a gift burnt-offering [without placing of the hands], from which we derive that an obligatory burnt-offering requires placing of the hands (Beitzah 20a).⁷

9:17 And he presented the meal-offering and he filled his hand from it, and he caused it to smoke upon the altar, aside from the burnt-offering of the morning.

and he filled his hand - It is written here "filling," and, elsewhere (*Ibid.* 2:2): "his full fistful." Just as there, if he took a fistful and there entered into it a pebble, a grain of salt, or a particle of frankincense, it is invalid, here, too, it is so (*Torath Cohanim*).8

and he filled his hand - I would not know [from this] whether the right hand or the left hand is being referred to. It is written (*Ibid.* 14:15): "And the priest shall take of the *log* of oil, and he shall pour it on the priest's left hand" — In *this* case it is the left hand; wherever else "hand" is written, the right hand is intended (*Menachoth* 9b).

aside from the burnt-offering of the morning - Why mention this? To teach us that there were two meal-offerings, one together with the burnt-offering and one by itself (*Torath Cohanim*). 10

- 9:18 And he slaughtered the ox and the ram, the sacrifice of the peace-offerings, which was the people's; and Aaron's sons presented the blood to him, and he sprinkled it on the altar roundabout.
- 9:19 And the fats from the ox and from the ram, the tail, and the cover [of the innards] and the kidneys, and the lobe of the liver.

9:20 And they put the fats upon the breasts, and he caused the fats to smoke upon the altar.

And they put, etc. - [It is written: "And they put," and "he caused"]; it was given to a different priest, who caused it to smoke — whence we derive that three priests are required, by reason of (14:28): "In a multitude of people is the King's glory" (Menachoth 62a). 11,12

the fats upon the breasts - Amemar said in the name of R. Pappa: One should not drag groins [of animals, which have fats on them] over flesh [This holds true only immediately after the cutting, before the flesh has cooled off (in which case it might absorb the fats), but after it has cooled off, it is permitted, as it is written: "and they put the fats upon the breasts" (Chullin 8b, Tosafoth).¹³

- 9:21 And the breasts and the right thigh Aaron lifted as a lifting before the L-rd, as Moses commanded.
- 9:22 And Aaron lifted his hands to the people, and he blessed them, and he went down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings.

And Aaron lifted his hands - From here it is derived that the priestly blessing is performed with the lifting of the hands (Sotah 38a).¹⁴

his hands - It is written: "his hand." From here it is derived that the priest must lift his right hand slightly higher than his left (Hagahoth Maimoni 14:3, Tefillah). 15

and he blessed them - This blessing was concealed until Scripture came and revealed it (*Numbers* 6:25): "The L-rd bless you and keep you, etc." (*Yerushalmi Ta'anith* 4:1). 16

and he blessed them - Standing or sitting? It is written (Deuteronomy 10:8): "to stand before the L-rd, to serve Him, and to bless in His name" — Just as he serves standing, so he blesses standing (Torath Cohanim).17

and he went down from offering - It is written: "And Aaron lifted his

hands to the people, and he blessed them, and he went down from offering the sin-offering." It is for this reason that the priestly blessing was instituted to be recited after the blessing of thanks [i.e., "whose name is good, and to You it is fitting to give thanks"] (Megillah 18a).¹⁸

and he went down from offering - R. Yehoshua b. Levi said: Any priest that does not go up to the priests' forum at the [blessing of the priestly] service [i.e., "Desire, O L-rd, our G-d, Your people, Israel ... and return the service"] does not go up afterwards, for it is written: "And Aaron lifted his hands to the people, and he blessed them, and he went down from offering the sin-offering." Just as there, [he blessed them] at [the end of] the service, here, too, at the service (Sotah 38b).¹⁹

and he went down from offering - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the lifting of the hands [in priestly blessing] is performed at mussaf? From: "And he blessed them, and he went down from offering the sin-offering." Should it not have been written: "And he went down from offering the sin-offering, and he blessed them"? We are hereby taught that in going down to the altar [after having offered the sin-offering, which is the mussaf offering] he lifted his hands and blessed the people [the verse being understood as: Because he went down from offering the sin-offering, he blessed them] (Yerushalmi Ta'anith 4:1).²⁰

- 9:23 And Moses and Aaron went into the tent of meeting, and they came out and they blessed the people, and the glory of the L-rd appeared to all the people.
- 9:24 And a fire came out from before the L-rd, and it consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fats; and all the people saw, and they exulted, and they fell upon their faces.
- 10:1 And the sons of Aaron took, each of them his coal-pan, and they put fire therein, and they laid incense thereon; and they offered before the L-rd a strange fire, which He had not commanded them.

10:2 And a fire came out from before the L-rd and consumed them, and they died before the L-rd.

and consumed them - the soul [i.e., "life"] burning and the body remaining intact (Sanhedrin 52a).

and they died - It was taught: R. Eliezer says: The sons of Aaron did not die until they taught a halachah in the presence of Moses, their teacher. What did they expound? (*Ibid.* 1:7): "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar." They said: Even though fire descends from Heaven, it is a mitzvah for men to bring it (*Eruvin* 63a).²

and they died before the L-rd - in the interior. Why, then, is it stated (5): "And they [Mishael and Eltzafan] drew near"? Were not Mishael and Eltzafan Levites, and forbidden from entering there? This teaches us that they extended an iron spear and drew them forth (Torath Cohanim).

10:3 And Moses said to Aaron: That is what the L-rd spoke, saying: With My near ones I will be sanctified, and before all the people I will be glorified, and Aaron kept his peace.

and Aaron kept his peace - Moses said to Aaron: Aaron, my brother, your sons died only to sanctify the name of the Holy One Blessed be He. And when Aaron was apprised that his sons were knowers of the L-rd, he kept silent and received reward, as it is written: "And Aaron kept his peace" (Zevachim 115b).³

- 10:4 And Moses called to Mishael and Eltzafan, the sons of Uziel, the uncle of Aaron, and he said to them: Draw near; carry your brothers from before the sanctuary outside of the camp.
- 10:5 And they drew near, and they carried them in their tunics outside of the camp, as Moses had said.

in their tunics - In the tunics of the carried or in the tunics of the carriers? It is written (Exodus 28:40): "And for Aaron's sons you shall make

tunics" — tunics were made for priests and not for Levites, and Mishael and Eltzafan were Levites (*Torath Cohanim*).

10:6 And Moses said to Aaron and to Elazar and to Ithamar, his sons: Your hair do not grow long and your clothes do not rend, so that you not die and He be wroth at the entire congregation; but let your brothers, the entire house of Israel, bewail the burning which the L-rd has burned.

And Moses said - It was taught: Rebbi says: In affirming greatness [as, in this instance, banning the abasement of mourning to the priests], we begin from the greater, as it is written: "And Moses said to Aaron and to Elazar and to Ithamar" (Ta'anith 15b).4

Your hair do not grow long - From here we derive that a mourner may not cut his hair; for since Scripture states relative to the sons of Aaron: "Your hair do not grow long," it is to be inferred that all other mourners may not cut their hair (Moed Katan 14b).

Your hair do not grow long - It was taught: Whence is it derived that a mourner may not cut his hair for thirty days? It is written here: "Your hair do not grow long," and, in respect to a Nazirite (Numbers 6:5): "He shall let the hair of his head grow long." Just as there [the period is] thirty days, here, too, thirty days (Ibid. 19b).6

Your hair do not grow long - It was taught: A mourner who did not let his hair grow long or rend his clothing incurs the punishment of death, for it is written: "Your hair do not grow long and your clothes do not rend, so that you not die," the implication being that if you fail to let your hair grow long and to rend your clothes, you are liable to death (*Ibid.* 24a).⁷

Your hair do not grow long-[lit., "Your heads do not uncover"] I might think this means that you should not remove your hat. It is written here: "uncover" and, elsewhere [in respect to a Nazirite] (Numbers 6:5): "He shall let the uncovering of the hair of his head grow long"; just as there, "uncovering" refers to letting the hair grow long, here, too, it refers to letting the hair grow long (Torath Cohanim).

and your clothes do not rend - A mourner must rend his clothes; for since

Scripture states relative to the sons of Aaron: "and your clothes do not rend," it is to be inferred that all other mourners are to rend their clothes (Mod Katan 15a).9

but let your brothers, etc. - The Rabbis taught: When the sons of R. Yishmael died, four elders came in to console him. R. Tarfon opened by saying: "But let your brothers, the entire house of Israel, bewail the burning which the L-rd has burned." Now if Nadav and Avihu, who did only one *mitzvah* — as it is written (*Ibid.* 9:9): "And the sons of Aaron presented the blood to him" — were mourned by the entire house of Israel, how much more so the sons of R. Yishmael! (*Moed Katan* 28b).¹⁰

10:7 And from the door of the tent of meeting you shall not go out, lest you die; for the anointing oil of the L-rd is upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

you shall not go out - I might think [that this obtains] even when he is not officiating; it is, therefore, written (*Ibid.* 21:12): "And from the sanctuary he shall not go out and not profane ..." When is he not to go out and not profane? At the time that he is officiating (*Torath Cohanim*)."

for the anointing oil of the L-rd - It was taught: Where in Scripture is the seven-day mourning period alluded to? R. Hoshiya said: It is written: "for the anointing oil of the L-rd is upon you." Just as you have been sated with the anointing oil all seven days [of the consecration], so keep watch over your brothers all seven days (Yerushalmi Moed Katan 3:5). 12

for the anointing oil of the L-rd is upon you - I might think that this [stricture on leaving while officiating] applied only to Aaron and his sons, who were ennobled with the anointing oil. Whence do I derive that it applies to priests in all generations? From: "for the anointing oil of the L-rd is upon you" [the priesthood of all generations having been consecrated by the original anointing oil] (Torath Cohanim). 13,14

according to the word of Moses - They confirmed upon themselves the mitzvah of Moses, their teacher (Torath Cohanim).

10:8 And the L-rd spoke to Aaron, saying:

10:9 Wine and strong drink do not drink, you and your sons with you, when you come to the tent of meeting, so that you not die, an everlasting statute throughout your generations.

Wine and strong drink - It was taught: R. Elazar says: "Wine and strong drink do not drink" — do not drink it in its inebriating form; if he paused in drinking or diluted it with some water, he is not liable (Krituth 13b).¹⁵

Wine and strong drink - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the service of priests who officiated while inebriated is profaned? From: "Wine and strong drink do not drink, followed by (10): "And to distinguish between the holy and the profane" (Zevachim 17b).16

you and your sons - I might think this [i.e., the stricture against wine] applies only upon entering. Whence do I derive that it applies also upon leaving? From: "you and your sons." Whence do I derive that the altar is comparable to the tent of meeting [in this respect]? From: "you and your sons. Whence do I derive that there is liability only at the time of the service? From: "you and your sons." (Torath Cohanim).¹⁷

you and your sons with you - What is the intent of "with you"? That they be like you [if they are to incur liability for drinking]. Just as you are fit to officiate, your sons, too, must be fit — to exclude those disqualified for the priesthood and those with blemishes (*Ibid.*).¹⁸

when you come - At the time of coming, there must be no inebriation (Bava Metzia 90b). 19

so that you not die - From here it is derived that priests who become inebriated incur the punishment of death (Sanhedrin 83b).²⁰

an everlasting statute - It is written here: "an everlasting statute," and, in respect to the necessity for the full complement of the priestly vestments for the validation of the service (*Exodus* 28:43): "an everlasting statute." Just as there, no distinction is made as to the facet of the service [being performed in the absence of the full complement, any facet being invalidated thereby], here, too, no distinction is made as to the particular facet of the service [any facet being invalidated by inebriation] (*Zevachim* 18a).²¹

10:10 And to distinguish between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the clean.

And to distinguish - It was taught: R. Yehoshua b. Levi says: All who separate from their wives close to the expection of their menstrual flow [thus creating a safe distance between the clean and the unclean] will have sons who are worthy of rendering halachic decisions; for it is written: "to distinguish ... (11): and to teach" (Shevuoth 18b).²²

And to distinguish, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "And to distinguish between the holy and the profane" — this refers to [inebriation as disqualifying one for] monetary assessments, valuations of animals dedicated to the sanctuary, allotments for sacred use, and Temple dedications; "between the unclean and the clean" — this refers to [rulings in matters of] uncleanliness and cleanliness (Krituth 13b).^{23,24}

10:11 And to teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the L-rd has spoken to them by the hand of Moses.

And to teach - The Rabbis taught: "to teach" — this refers to ruling [in matters of halachah, inebriation disqualifying one for such ruling]; "all the statutes" — this refers to received tradition; "which the L-rd has spoken" — this refers to [the study of] halachah; "by the hand of Moses" — this refers to [the study of Gemara]. I might think that [the study of] Mishnah, too, were included [in those studies proscribed to the inebriated]; it is, therefore, written: "and to teach" [and Mishnah is not studied to the end of ruling on halachic matters]. R. Yossi b. Yehudah says: I might think that Gemara, too, were included; it is, therefore, written: "and to teach" [non-ruling-oriented study of the Gemara, accordingly, being permitted to the inebriated] (Ibid.). 25-28

10:12 And Moses spoke to Aaron and to Elazar and Ithamar, his remaining sons: Take the meal-offering that remains from the fire-offerings of the L-rd, and eat it, unleavened, beside the altar, for it is holy of holies.

his remaining sons - It was taught: Fortunate are the righteous. Not only do they bring merit unto themselves, but also to their sons and to the sons

of their sons, until the end of all the generations. For Aaron had several sons who would have deserved to be burned, as Nadav and Avihu, it being written: "his remaining sons", but the merit of their father saved them (Yoma 87a).²⁹

beside the altar - Now did they eat it beside the altar? [Could they not eat it in the entire azarah?] [The implication is that they could eat it] only when the altar was whole and not when it was defective. From here it is derived that if the altar became defective, the left-overs of the meal-offering are not eaten in consequence. Whence do we derive [the same ruling for] holy of holies? From: "for it is holy of holies" (Zevachim 61a).³⁰

beside the altar - beside the altar, and not in the sanctuary, and not on top of the altar (*Torath Cohanim*).³¹

10:13 And you shall eat it in a holy place, for it is your portion and the portion of your sons from the fire-offerings of the L-rd; for thus have I been commanded.

And you shall eat it in a holy place - What is the intent of "it"? — "it" in a holy place, but not others [such as breads of thanksgiving] in a holy place [The others may be eaten outside of the azarah so long as the place is clean.] (Zevachim 58a). 32

and the portion of your sons - the portion of your sons, and not the portion of your daughters (Torath Cohanim).³³

from the fire-offerings of the L-rd - This teaches us that the priests do not acquire it until after the fire-offering (*Ibid.*).³⁴

for thus have I been commanded - The Rabbis taught: "for thus have I been commanded"; (18): "as I commanded"; (15): "as the L-rd commanded" — "for thus have I been commanded" — that they should eat [the meal-offering] while they were mourners [which is otherwise forbidden]; "as I commanded" — he had told them [that they could eat it while mourning] at the time [when they had become mourners]; "as the L-rd commanded" — and I am not saying this of myself (Zevachim 101a).35

10:14 And the breast of lifting and the thigh of offering you shall eat in a clean place, you and your sons, and your daughters with you; for as your due and the due of your sons they have been given from the sacrifices of the peace-offerings of the children of Israel.

you shall eat in a clean place - It was taught: R. Nechemiah said: "you shall eat in a clean place" — Now were the preceding offerings eaten in uncleanliness! [The fact that the word "holy" is not used, but] "clean," indicates that some uncleanliness obtains. [How is it to be understood, then?] Clean from the uncleanliness of a leper, but unclean with zav [genital discharge] uncleanliness. Where is this [condition] to be found? In the encampment of the Israelites [as opposed to that of the Levites] (Ibid. 55a). 36,37

and your daughters with you - "with you" — when they are with you [i.e., unmarried] (Yevamoth 87a).³⁸

10:15 The thigh of the offering and the breast of the lifting upon the fire-offerings of the fats shall they bring, to lift as a lifting before the L-rd; and it shall be for you and your sons with you, as an ordinance forever, as the L-rd has commanded.

upon the fire-offerings of the fats - The Rabbis taught: How is the *mitzvah* of lifting performed? He puts the devoted portions on the palm of the hand, and the breast and thigh upon them. Why so? For it is written: "the thigh of the offering and the breast of the lifting upon the fire-offerings of the fats" (*Menachoth* 62a).³⁹

10:16 And the goat of the sin-offering, Moses sought, sought, and behold, it was burnt; and he was angry with Elazar and with Ithamar, the remaining sons of Aaron, saying:

And the goat of the sin-offering, Moses sought - It was taught: "goat" — this is the goat of Nachshon [the first of the nasi'im (the leaders of the tribes)]; "sin-offering" — this is the sin-offering of the eighth day [of

consecration]; "sought" — this is the goat of Rosh Chodesh. I might think that all of them were burnt; it is, therefore, written: "and, behold, it was burnt" — one of them was burnt, and not all three (Zevachim 101b).40

sought, sought - This marks the mid-point of the words in the Torah [i.e., the first "sought" ends the first half, and the second "sought" begins the second [(Kiddushin 30a).41]

sought, sought - Why these two "sought"? He asked them: Why was this sin-offering burned and these left? (Zevachim 101b).42

and, behold, it was burned - I would not know which one. From what follows, however (17): "and it He has given you to forgive the iniquity of the congregation to make atonement for them," I deduce that it is the goat of Rosh Chodesh (*Ibid.*). 43,44

the remaining sons of Aaron - "the sons of Aaron" — this teaches us that Aaron, too, was the object of G-d's anger; "the remaining" — Pinchas was not with them (Torath Cohanim). 45,46

10:17 Why did you not eat the sin-offering in the place of the sanctuary, for it is holy of holies, and it He has given you to forgive the iniquity of the congregation to make atonement for them before the L-rd.

Why did you not eat, etc. - He asked them: Perhaps [you burned it and did not eat it because] its blood was brought into the interior [i.e., into the Holy of Holies, in which case the offering is rendered invalid]. He answered (18): "Behold, its blood was not brought into the sanctuary within." Perhaps it left its prescribed precincts. He answered: It remained in the sanctuary. [Moses asked]: Perhaps they [your sons] sacrificed it in [their state of mourning] and thus rendered it invalid. He answered: Did they sacrifice it? I sacrificed it [and a high priest who is a mourner is permitted to sacrifice]. Perhaps, being distracted in your mourning, you abused it and it became unclean. He answered: Moses, am I such a one in your eyes as to abuse holy of holies? "And if such had happened to me" (19) — even these [that died] and such [others] — I would not abuse the holy things of Heaven. Moses answered: If so, why

did you not eat, as I commanded, that it may be eaten in mourning? Aaron answered: Moses, perhaps you have not heard that [it may be eaten] only in the mourning of night, for if in the day [of burial], it may be derived a fortiori from ma'aser [the tithe], which, though of a lesser order of sanctity, is written of in the Torah, viz. (Deuteronomy 26:14): "I have not eaten in my mourning of it" — how much more so would the eating of higher order sanctity be forbidden! Immediately (20): "And Moses heard, and it was good in his eyes" (Zevachim 101a). 47-49

10:18 Behold, its blood was not brought into the sanctuary within; you should have eaten it in the sanctuary as I commanded.

into the sanctuary within - The Rabbis taught: "within" — this tells me only of the interior; whence do I derive that the entire sanctuary is intended? From: "into the sanctuary within." Why, then, is "within" stated? Rava answered: One comes and enlightens us as to the other [i.e., if "sanctuary alone were written, I would say that it referred only to the innermost part; the additional "within" reveals "sanctuary" as referring to the entire sanctuary] (*Ibid.* 86b).⁵⁰

10:19 And Aaron spoke to Moses: Behold, today they have offered their sin-offerings and their burnt-offerings before the L-rd, and if such had happened to me, and if I had eaten a sin-offering today, would it have been good in the eyes of the L-rd?

and if I had eaten a sin-offering - [It is not written: "and if I had sacrificed a sin-offering," but: "and if I had eaten a sin-offering," from which it is derived that a high priest may sacrifice when he is a mourner [(Moed Katan 14b, see Rashi).51]

and if I had eaten a sin-offering today - [eating of the sin-offering in] the daytime is forbidden [to a mourner] and the evening is permitted [From here it is derived that "mourning" according to the Torah obtains only during the day [of the burial] (Torath Cohanim). 52

152

10:20 And Moses heard, and it was good in his eyes.

And Moses heard - He confessed, and was not moved by shame to say: "I did not hear" [the law from the L-rd], but he admitted: I heard it and I forgot it (Zevachim 101b).53

And Moses heard - Sore is resentment, which caused Moses to err [in this law of mourning]. And what caused his resentment? His error (Torath Cohanim).54

- 11:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying to them:
- 11:2 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: This is the animal that you shall eat, of every beast which is upon the earth.

This is the animal - The school of R. Yishmael taught: "This is the animal" — this teaches us that the Holy One Blessed be He took hold of each kind and showed it to Moses, saying to him: This eat, and this do not eat (Chullin 41a).1

This is the animal - [lit.]: "This is the living thing that you shall eat" What will live [i.e., a healthy animal], eat; what will not live, do not eat. From here it is derived that a treifah [lit., a torn animal] is not considered living (Ibid. 42a).2

This is the animal - followed by: "of every beast," which implies that "beast" is in the category of "animal" (Ibid. 71a).3

of every beast - Whence is it derived that kilaim [the offspring of an animal and a beast] is included? From: "This is the animal that you shall eat, of every beast" [see above] (Torath Cohanim).4

which is upon the earth - to exclude those in the sea [from being permitted by the cleanliness signs of the land animals] (Ibid.).5

11:3 Whatever has parted hooves, and whose hooves are wholly cloven, and which chews its cud among the beasts — it you shall eat.

Whatever has parted hooves, etc. - The Rabbis taught: These are signs of a clean animal [to be used, respectively, as general guidelines in the absence of the other signs (e.g., if the hooves are cut off, the tooth sign can be used as a guideline]: one which has no upper teeth, one which has split hooves, and one whose flesh is striated lengthwise and crosswise (Chullin 59a).6

it you shall eat - What is the intent of "it"? "It," and not an unclean animal (Zevachim 34a).

11:4 Only this you shall not eat of those that chew the cud and of those whose hooves are parted: the camel, because it chews the cud and its hoof is not parted; it is unclean to you.

Only this - This you may not eat, but you may eat [a different one] that comes with one sign of cleanliness. Which is that? An unclean animal [having only one sign] that is born of a clean animal and whose conception was through a clean animal [i.e., who was sired through a clean animal] (Bechoroth 7a).8

Only this - I might think that even the flesh of bipeds [i.e., human beings] is forbidden; it is, therefore, written: "Only this" (Torath Cohanim).

Only this you shall not eat - The Rabbis taught: From its being stated that what has the signs may be eaten, I can infer that what lacks the signs may not be eaten; and from its being stated that what lacks the signs may not be eaten, I can infer that what has the signs may be eaten. Why, then, state both? To make the violator subject to the transgression of both a positive and a negative commandment (Chullin 66b). 10

of those that chew the cud - The Rabbis taught: "Only this you shall not eat of those that chew the cud and of those whose hooves are parted"—there is an animal which, though chewing its cud and having split hooves, may not be eaten. What is that? A clean animal born of an unclean one (Bechoroth 6a)."

of those that chew the cud, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that a substitute for invalidated sanctified animals [i.e., sanctified animals

which had sustained a blemish and been redeemed] must be allowed to die [and may not be offered up or redeemed itself]? From: of those that chew the cud ... it is unclean." And whence is it derived that five [animals in the class of] sin-offerings [i.e., the offspring of a sin-offering, the substitute for a sin-offering, a sin-offering whose owner had died, a sin-offering which had been lost and which was found after atonement had been made with another animal, and a sin-offering whose year had expired — whence is it derived that these] must be allowed to die? From: "and of those whose hooves are parted ... it is unclean" (*Ibid.* 16a). 12-14

the camel - It was taught: "camel" - "camel" [here and in *Deuteronomy* 14:7] — why are both necessary? One for itself [i.e., to rule that the flesh of a camel is forbidden] and one for its fats (*Ibid.* 6b). 15,16

the camel - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: The Ruler of His universe knows that there is no animal which chews the cud and yet is unclean but the camel [and the others specified here]. It is for this reason that it [and the others] were thus singled out by Scripture (Chullin 59a).¹⁷

it is unclean to you - What is the intent of this? "It" is unclean, but the fats and blood of bipeds [i.,e., human beings] is not unclean, but clean (Kethuvoth 60a).18

it is unclean to you - What is the intent of this? "It" is unclean, but an unclean animal born of a clean animal is not unclean, but clean (Bechoroth 6b).¹⁹

- 11:5 And the coney, because it chews the cud, but has not parted hooves, it is unclean to you.
- 11:6 And the hare, because it chews the cud, but has not parted hooves, it is unclean to you.

And the hare - It happend with Ptolemy the king that he once assembled seventy-two elders and placed them (respectively) in seventy-two rooms, and told each one: Write for me the Torah of Moses your teacher. The Holy One Blessed be He caused wisdom to repose in the heart of each of them, and they all wrote as with one mind: "and the slender-legged"

instead of: "and the hare," for the wife of Ptolemy was called "Hare" (Megillah 9a).20

11:7 And the swine, because its hooves are parted and it is cloven-footed, but it does not chew the cud, it is unclean to you.

And the swine - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: The Ruler of His universe knows that there is no animal which has split hooves and yet is unclean, but the swine. It is for this reason that it was thus singled out by Scripture (Chullin 59b).²¹

11:8 Of their flesh do not eat, and their carcass do not touch—they are unclean to you.

Of their flesh - "of their flesh," and not of their bones, or sinews, or hooves (Torath Cohanim).²²

and their carcass do not touch - It was taught: I might think that Israelites [as opposed to priests] are exhorted against touching a carcass; it is, therefore, written (*Ibid.* 21:1): "Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron... with a dead body he shall not become unclean" — priests are exhorted, but Israelites are not exhorted. Now can we not deduce the ruling a fortiori: If Israelites are not exhorted against the severer uncleanliness [of touching a dead body], how much more so are they not exhorted against the lesser uncleanliness [of touching a carcass]! What, then, is the intent of: "and their carcass do not touch"? On a festival. This was R. Yitzchak's source for: One must cleanse himself on a festival (Rosh Hashanah 16b).^{23,24}

unclean - It was taught: "unclean" — this teaches us that they [unforbidden quantities of unclean animals] combine with each other [to form forbidden quantities]; "unclean" — to forbid their brine, marrow, and jelly (Torath Cohanim). 25,26

they are unclean - "they" — to exclude an instance in which they are not present to the taste (Torath Cohanim).²⁷

they are unclean to you - "to you" [for eating purposes] — but you are permitted to derive benefit from them (*Ibid.*).²⁸

11:9 This you may eat of all that is in the water: all that has fins and scales in the water, in the seas and in the rivers, those you may eat.

This you may eat, etc. - It is written: "This you may eat of all that is in the water," and: "all that has fins and scales in the water, in the seas and in the rivers, those you may eat." What is the intent of: "all that is in the water"? [The meaning is that] in the seas and in the rivers, what possesses these signs you may eat, and what does not possess them, you may not eat, but in vessels, though they may not possess these signs, you may eat [i.e., water may be drunk from basins inhabited by small fish which may not possess these signs] (Chullin 66b).²⁹

of all that is in the water - to include holes, pits, and caves, into which a man may dip and drink from without apprehension [see above] (*Ibid.*).³⁰

fins and scales - What are fins and what are scales? Fins guide the fishes' movement; scales are stationary (*Ibid.* 59a).³¹

fins and scales - Every fish that has scales has fins, and there are some fishes that have fins, but do not have scales. [If that is so] let Scripture write "scales," and "fins" would not be needed. R. Avahu answered: "let Torah be magnified and glorified!" (*Ibid.* 66b).³²

fins and scales - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if it has only one fin and one scale it is permitted? From [lit.,]: "a fin and a scale" (*Torath Cohanim*).³³

those you may eat - to include a clean fish in the maw of an unclean fish [that had swallowed it] I might think that an unclean fish in the maw of a clean fish were included; it is, therefore, written: "those" (Ibid.). 34,35

those you may eat - "you may eat" — to include a clean fish that had been preserved together with an unclean one [though they share a common brine]; I might think this is so even when the clean fish had been ground; it is, therefore, written: "those" [i.e., they must be distinctly discernible as clean] (Ibid.). 36

11:10 But all that do not have fins and scales in the seas and in the rivers, of all that swarm in the water, and of every living creature that is in the water, they are detestable to you.

But all that do not have - "But all" — to include even those which have bones but do not reproduce, and those which reproduce but do not have bones (*Ibid.*).³⁷

But all that do not have - See (4), commentary on: "Only this you shall not eat."

living creature - "living" — this is the "sea-animal"; "creature" — to include the "siren" [half-human, half-fish]. I might think that it would cause uncleanliness in a tent; it is, therefore, written (Numbers 19:14): "This [is the Torah; if a man (i.e., a whole man) die in a tent"] (Ibid.).

they are detestable to you - "detestable" — to forbid their brine, marrow, and jelly; "they" — to exclude an instance in which they are not present to the taste; "to you" [for eating purposes] — but you are permitted to derive benefit from them (*Ibid.*).³⁹

11:11 And they shall be detestable to you. Of their flesh you shall not eat, and their carcass you shall hold in detestation.

And they shall be detestable - to include their admixture [i.e., if an unclean fish became mixed up with clean ones, they are all forbidden] (*Ibid.*).⁴⁰

And they shall be detestable to you - R. Avahu said: Wherever it is written: "it may not be eaten," both eating and the derivation of benefit are implied. But does the Torah not write of creeping things (41): "It is detestable; it may not be eaten," in spite of which we learned (Shvi'ith 7:4): Hunters of fowl and fish, who chanced upon unclean species may sell them to gentiles! That is different, for Scripture states: "to you" — to you shall they be. If so, it should be permitted from the very beginning [and not only if they were "chanced upon"]! Scripture states: "they shall be" — they shall remain in their forbidden state (Pesachim 23a).41

Of their flesh - "of their flesh," and not of their bones, and not of their fins (Torath Cohanim).⁴²

Of their flesh you shall not eat - The Rabbis taught: From its being stated that what has the signs may be eaten, I can infer that what lacks the signs may not be eaten. Why, then, state both? To make the violator subject to the transgression of both a positive and a negative commandment (Chullin 66b).⁴³

and their carcass you shall hold in detestation - to include the parasites in an animal (*Ibid.* 67b).⁴⁴

11:12 Whatever has no fins and scales in the water is detestable to you.

fins or scales - What is the intent of this [i.e., Why mention it again]? I might think that [only that fish is clean] which brings its signs of cleanliness with it to the dry land. If it left them in the water, how do I know [that it is still permitted]? From: "in the water" (Torath Cohanim). 45,46

is detestable to you - It is not permitted to trade in it (Ibid.). 47

11:13 And these you shall hold in detestation of the fowl. They shall not be eaten; they are detestable: the great vulture, and the bearded vulture, and the osprey.

they are detestable - It was taught: "And these you shall hold in detestation of the fowl. They shall not be eaten: they are detestable." "Of" and "they" are words of exclusion — to exclude their beak, claws, wings, and feathers (Torath Cohanim). 48

the great vulture - It was taught: "And these you shall hold in detestation of the fowl... the great vulture..." Just as the great vulture is characterized by the absence of an additional claw [on the hind part of the leg] and of a crop, by a claw that does not peel easily, and by grasping with its claws and eating, and is unclean, so, all birds that are thus characterized are unclean (Chullin 61a). 49-52

11:14 And the kite and the falcon after its kind.

And the kite - Here it is written: "da'ah," and, in Deuteronomy (14:13): "ra'ah." This teaches us that "da'ah" and "ra'ah" are one species (Ibid. 63a).⁵³

and the falcon - Here it is written: "ayah," and, in Deuteronomy (14:13): "dayah." This teaches us that "ayah" and "dayah" are one species (Ibid. b).⁵⁴

11:15 Every raven after its kind.

Every raven after its kind - The Rabbis taught: "raven" — this is the black raven; "every raven" — to include the "deep" [i.e., white] raven; "after its kind" — to include the pigeon-headed raven (*Ibid.* a). 55,56

11:16 And the ostrich, and the night-hawk, and the sea-mew, and the hawk after its kind.

And the ostrich - Chezkiah said: Whence is it derived that the egg of an unclean bird is forbidden? From: "And the ostrich" [lit., "the daughter of the ostrich"]. Now does the ostrich have a daughter! The reference is, perforce, to the egg of an unclean bird (*Ibid.* 64b).⁵⁷

and the hawk after its kind - to include bar charya (Ibid. 63a).58

- 11:17 And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl.

 and the cormorant What is the "cormorant"? A bird that scoops up fishes from the sea (*Ibid.*).⁵⁹
- 11:18 And the horned owl, and the pelican, and the carrion-vulture.

And the horned owl - This is a night-bird, the kifuf (Ibid.).60 and the pelican - This is the kik (Ibid.).61

and the carrion-vulture - This is the shrakrak. Why is it called "racham" ["mercy"]? When "racham," comes, mercy comes to the world (Ibid.).62

11:19 And the stork, and the heron after its kind, and the hoopoe, and the bat.

And the stork - R. Yehudah said: "the stork" — this is the white dayah. Why is it called "chasidah" [lit., "the gracious one"]? Because it engages in lovingkindness [i.e., it shares its food] with its fellows (Ibid.). 63

and the heron - R. Yehudah said: "the heron" — this is the volatile dayah. Why is it called "anafah"? Because it cohabits with its fellows ["niuf" = illicit intercourse] (Ibid.).64

and the hoopoe - R. Yehudah said: Why is it called "duchifath" [lit., "double-compressed"]? For its crown is doubled up into its head (*Ibid.*).⁶⁵

- 11:20 All creeping things that fly, which walk on four, are detestable to you.
- 11:21 Only this shall you eat of all creeping things that fly, which walk on four that which has jointed legs above its feet, with which to spring upon the earth.

of all creeping things that fly - You do not eat an unclean creeping thing that flies, but you do eat what an unclean flying thing exudes. And what is that? The honey of bees (Bechoroth 7b).66

which has jointed legs - [It is written: "not" (i.e., "which does not have jointed legs"), but it is read as: "to it" (i.e., "which has to it jointed legs"). This teaches us] that even if it does not have them now, but is destined to grow them (as in the case of the zachal [a kind of locust]), it is permitted (Chullin 65a).⁶⁷

11:22 These of them you may eat: the locust after its kind, and the bald locust after its kind, and the cricket after its kind, and the grasshopper after its kind.

the locust, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "locust" — this is the guvai; "bald

locust"—this is the salam; "cricket"—this is the nippol; "grasshopper"—this is the gidyan (Ibid.).⁶⁸

after its kind, etc. - Why does Scripture state: "after its kind," "after its kind," "after its kind," four times? To include tziporeth keramim, yochna Yerushalmith, artzuvia, and razvanith [which, though not similar in appearance to those in the verse, have the same species signs] (Ibid.).69

11:23 And every creeping thing that flies, which has four legs; it is detestable to you.

it is detestable - "it" — to exclude their admixture. From here they ruled: unclean grasshoppers which were preserved together with clean ones do not render their [common] brine unfit. R. Tzadok testified: Their brine [i.e., that of unclean grasshoppers] itself is clean (Torath Cohanim).

11:24 And through these you shall become unclean; all who touch their carcass will be unclean until evening.

And through these you shall become unclean - I might think that this applied to all that is mentioned in this context [including the unclean creatures enumerated above]; it is, therefore, written (25): "Every beast" [i.e., it applies only to the "beasts" mentioned below] (Ibid.). 71

all who touch their carcass - The Rabbis taught: "their carcass," and not an intact marrow-bone. I might think [that this is so] even if it had been pierced; it is, therefore, written: "who touch ... will be unclean" — what may possibly be touched [such as the marrow in a pierced bone] is unclean, and what cannot be touched is clean (Chullin 126b).⁷²

- 11:25 And everyone that carries of their carcass shall wash his clothing and be clean until the evening.
- 11:26 Through every beast whose hoof is parted, but is not

cloven-footed and does not chew the cud. They are unclean to you; everyone who touches them shall be unclean.

11:27 And all who walk upon their soles, among all animals which walk on four; they are unclean to you. All who touch their carcass will be unclean until evening.

And all who walk upon their soles - This is the ape. "All who walk"—to include the hedgehog, and the porcupine, and the orangoutang, and the sea-dog (Torath Cohanim).⁷³

which walk on four - to include unclean animals; "among all animals" — to include the elephant (*Ibid.*). 74,75

- 11:28 And he that carries their carcass shall wash his clothes, and he shall be unclean until the evening; they are unclean to you.
- 11:29 And this to you is what is unclean among the creeping things which creep upon the earth: the weasel, and the mouse, and the great lizard after its kind.

And this to you is what is unclean - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: The cleanliness signs of creeping things were difficult to Moses until the Holy One Blessed be He pointed them out to him with the finger, as it is written: "And this to you is what is unclean" (Menachoth 29a).⁷⁶

And this to you is what is unclean - We are hereby taught that the blood and the flesh of a creeping thing combine with each other [to constitute an uncleanliness quantity when each in itself is less than that quantity] (Krituth 4b).

And this to you is what is unclean - This is unclean, but the fats and blood of bipeds [i.e., human beings] are not unclean, but clean (*Ibid.* 22a).⁷⁸

And this to you is what is unclean - R. Matia b. Cheresh asked R. Shimon

b. Yochai: Whence is it derived that the blood of creeping things is unclean? From: "And this to you is what is unclean" (Me'ilah 17a)."

among the creeping things which creep upon the earth - It is written: "among the creeping things which creep," implying wherever it creeps, and it is written: "upon the earth" [implying that it must be upon the earth to convey uncleanliness]! How is this to be understood? If he is certain that he touched it, he is unclean [whether it is on the earth or floating on the water]; if he is in doubt as to whether he touched it [in an instance of its floating on the water], he is clean. From here it is derived that if one is in doubt as to whether he touched a floating unclean thing, whether it were floating in [the water of] a vessel or on earth [in the water of a vessel (and he is in doubt as to whether he touched the vessel)], he is clean (Nazir 64a).80

among the creeping things which creep upon the earth - The Rabbis taught: From its being written: "mouse," I infer even the sea-mouse; it is, therefore, written: "upon the earth." If: "upon the earth," I would think that if it went down to the sea it would not cause uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "which creep" — wherever it creeps. Whence do I derive for inclusion a mouse which is half-flesh, half-earth? From: "among the creeping things" (Chullin 126b). 81,82

and the great lizard after its kind - The Rabbis taught: "the great lizard after its kind" — to include the arod, the ben hanefilim, and the salamander (*Ibid.* 127a).⁸³

11:30 And the gecko, and the land-crocodile, and the lizard, and the sand-lizard, and the chameleon.

and the chameleon - The Rabbis taught: "the chameleon" — the night-lizard, namely, the mole (*Ibid.* 63a). 84

11:31 These are what are unclean to you among all that creep. Everyone who touches them in their death will be unclean until the evening.

These are what are unclean - The Rabbis taught: "what are unclean" -

to include their skin as their flesh. I might think that even all [the others mentioned in (29) are included in skin-uncleanliness]; it is, therefore, written: "These" [i.e., only these five in (30)]. But doesn't "These" refer to all [including those in (29)]? Rav answered: "after its kind" (29) separates [those mentioned above from the five which follow, so that "These" refers only to the latter] (Ibid. 122b).85

what are unclean - It was taught: "what are unclean" — to forbid their brine, marrow, and jelly (*Ibid*.112b). 86

what are unclean - The Rabbis taught: "what are unclean" — to include the eggs and the marrow-bone of reptiles. I might think [that the eggs convey uncleanliness] even if the embryo were not formed; it is, therefore, written: "that creep" — just as in the creeping things the embryo has been formed, the egg, too, [to convey uncleanliness] requires an embryo that has been formed. I might think [that the eggs and marrow-bone convey uncleanlines] even if they have not been pierced; it is, therefore, written: "who touches ... will be unclean" — what may possibly be touched is unclean, and what cannot be touched is clean (Ibid. 126b). 87,88

what are unclean - It was taught: "what are unclean" — this teaches us that they [the flesh of the different creeping things mentioned herein] combine with each other [to constitute an uncleanliness quantity, when each in itself is below that quantity] (Me'ilah 17a).89

among all that creep - It was taught: I might think that flesh which separated from creeping things was unclean; it is, therefore, written: "among all that creep" — just as a creeping thing has flesh, sinews, and bones, so all [that separates from a creeping thing, to convey uncleanliness, must possess] flesh, sinews, and bones (Chullin 128b).

Everyone who touches them - If "them," I would think [that he would have to touch] all of them [i.e., a whole reptile, to become unclean]; it is, therefore, written (32): "of" them." If "of them," I would think that part of them [would be sufficient to convey uncleanliness]; it is, therefore, written: "them." How can this be reconciled? [i.e., How can it be all of them and part of them at the same time?] He must touch a part of it which can be considered all of it [i.e., He must touch what can constitute the size of a particular creeping thing], and the sages estimated this as the

size of a lentil, for the sand-lizard (30) is initially of lentil size (*Chagigah* 11a). 91

Everyone who touches them - If "them," I would think all of them; it is, therefore, written (32): "of them." If "of them," I would think that part of them would be sufficient. How is this to be reconciled? Here [where touching a part of a reptile suffices for the conveying of uncleanliness] a wet state is being referred to [i.e., when that part is moist]; there [where it is necessary to touch a whole reptile for uncleanliness to be conveyed] a dry state is being referred to [i.e., when the reptile is dry] (Niddah 56a).

them in their death - "them" — even if they have been slaughtered [and not died of themselves]; "in their death" — and not in their life (*Torath Cohanim*).⁹³

in their death - A creeping thing causes uncleanliness only in a wet state and not in a dry state. Why so? For Scripture states: "in their death" — [moist] as at the time of death (Niddah 56a).94

11:32 And all whereon it falls of them in their death shall be unclean: of all vessels of wood, or garment, or skin, or sack.

Any vessel with which work is done shall be put into water; and it shall be unclean until the evening, and then it shall be clean.

in their death - What is the intent of "in their death"? If to exclude "in their life," this is derivable from: "of their carcass." It must be to teach us, then, that death creates "falling-off" [i.e., a hanging limb is considered to have fallen off with the animal's natural death, and, accordingly, imparts the uncleanliness of a limb torn from a living animal (eiver min hachai)], but slaughtering does not create "falling-off" [i.e., a hanging limb is not considered to have fallen off with the slaughtering of the animal, and, though the limb may not be eaten, it does not impart the uncleanliness of a limb torn from a living animal] (Chullin 74a).95

of all vessels of wood - "of all vessels of wood," and not all vessels of wood — to exclude a ladder, a rack, a tray, and a lamp. I might think that I exclude a table, a tavla, and a dolfak [also kinds of tables]; it is,

therefore, writen: "all vessels of wood," for extension of inclusion [those articles which serve both man and his "servers" (i.e., articles which are of service to him) being included, and those which serve only one of these, being excluded [(Torath Cohanim).96,97]

or garment - "or" — to include a piece of wool or flax the size of three by three fingers in creeping-thing uncleanliness (Shabbath 27a). 98

or garment - [This tells me only of three by three fingers in a garment of wool or flax. Whence do I derive three by three tefachim (hand-breadths) in other garments? From: "or" garment"] (Ibid.). 99

or garment - This tells me only of a garment of wool or flax. Whence do I derive for inclusion the wool of camels and the wool of rabbits, the down of goats, silks, *kelach* and *srikin* [also types of silks]? From: "or garment" (*Ibid.*). 100,101

or garment - Whence is it derived that a woven piece of cloth of any size [if it is a garment in itself (as opposed to the afore-mentioned instances of pieces torn off from garments)] is susceptible of creeping-thing uncleanliness? From: "or garment" (*Ibid.* 63b). 102

or garment or skin - It was taught: "garment or skin" is stated in respect to creeping things, and "garment or skin" is stated in respect to dead-body uncleanliness (*Numbers* 31:20). Just as "garment or skin" stated in respect to dead-body uncleanliness includes (*Ibid.*): "all work of goats' hair," so "garment or skin" stated in respect to creeping-thing uncleanliness includes all work of goats' hair (*Ibid.* 64a). 103

or garment or skin - "skin" is likened to "garment." Just as a garment comes from what grows in the earth, so skin [to acquire uncleanliness] must come from what "grows" in the earth [i.e., from land animals, as opposed to sea-animals] (Torath Cohanim). 104

or sack - The Rabbis taught: "sack" — this tells me only sack. Whence do I derive for inclusion *kalkali* and *chebek* [types of saddle bands]? From: "or sack." I might think that I include ropes and bands; it is, therefore, written: "sack" — just as a sack is reticulated, so all must be reticulated [to acquire uncleanliness] (Shabbath 64a). 105,106

or sack - It was taught: I might think that this applies only to what

comes from goats [see above on *Numbers* 31:20]. Whence do I derive for inclusion what comes from the tail of a horse and the tail of a cow? From: "or sack" (*Ibid.*). 107.108

or sack - It was taught: Any wooden vessel which is made to rest[and not to be moved] does not acquire uncleanliness. Why so? [For it is written: "of all vessels of wood ... or sack"] It must be like sack. Just as a sack can be moved, full or empty, so all that can be moved, full or empty (Chagigah 26b). 109

11:33 And every earthen vessel which there shall fall of them into its midst, whatever is in its midst shall become unclean, and it shall you break.

And every earthen vessel - to include vessels made of alum crystals, and shards of earthen vessels, and to include tent-like vessels (*Torath Cohanim*). 110,111

which there shall fall of them - to exclude [the instance of] a rooster which swallowed a creeping thing and fell into the midst of an oven, in which instance the oven is clean [the creeping thing destined to be consumed by the rooster]; but if the rooster was dead, the oven is unclean (*Ibid.*).¹¹²

into its midst - "its midst" is stated in respect to conferring uncleanliness ["whatever is in its midst shall become unclean"], and "its midst" is stated in respect to acquiring uncleanliness ["which there shall fall of them into its midst"]; just as "its midst" in respect to conferring uncleanliness applies even where the creeping thing has not touched [the food in its midst], so, too, "its midst" in respect to acquiring uncleanliness applies even where the creeping thing has not touched [the vessel itself, but only entered its air space] (Chullin 24b). 113-115

into its midst - "its midst" is written four times [i.e., though "midst" is actually written only two times, the addition of "its" renders it equivalent to four for exegetical purposes] — once for the statement itself, once for the comparison [above], once to indicate the midst of this [vessel] and not the midst of another [i.e., if a vessel containing a creeping thing were placed into a second vessel, the latter is clean], and once to indicate its

midst and not the midst of its midst [i.e., if a vessel containing food were placed into an unclean vessel, the first remains clean] (Ibid. 25a). 116-118

into its midst - Anything which does not have a "midst" in an earthen vessel does not have a back [i.e., if unclean water touched the back of a vessel which does not have a midst, it is not rendered unclean] (Torath Cohanim). 119

into its midst - to exclude an earthenware bed, chair, bench, table, boat or lamp which have no midst (*Ibid*.). 120

into its midst - It [the creeping thing] renders it unclean from its midst, and not from its back (R. Ovadiah Bartenurah, Kelim 2:1).¹²¹

whatever is in its midst - It was taught: I might think that all vessels would be rendered unclean by entry into the atmosphere of an earthen vessel; it is, therefore, written: "whatever is in its midst shall become unclean," followed by (34): "of all the food that is eaten" — food is rendered unclean in the atmosphere of an earthen vessel, but vessels are not rendered unclean in the atmosphere of an earthen vessel (Shabbath 138b). 122

whatever is in its midst - "in its midst," and not in the midst of its midst [see above on the four teachings of "its midst"]. I might think that this is so [i.e., that what is in the inner vessel remains clean] even if it [the inner vessel] has been perforated; it is, therefore, written: "whatever is in its midst" [and in the case of perforation, the inner vessel is deemed to have lost its integrity and its contents are regarded as contained in the outer, unclean vessel] (Torath Cohanim). [23, 124]

shall become unclean - R. Akiva expounded: It is not written "tamei" [which can refer only to the acquiring of uncleanliness], but "yitma" [which can also be read: "yetamei,"] which refers to the conferring of uncleanliness to others. This teaches us that a loaf of second-degree uncleanliness [i.e., one that is in an oven which has acquired first-degree uncleanliness by contact with a creeping thing, a progenitor of uncleanliness,] confers third-degree uncleanliness [upon food with which it comes in contact] (Sotah 27b). 125,126

11:34 Of all the food that is eaten, upon which there comes water,

shall be unclean; and every drink, which is drunk in every vessel, shall be unclean.

Of all the food - "Of all the food," and not all the food — to exclude animal food, and to exclude food sealed air-tight in an earthen vessel placed in a stove (Torath Cohanim). 127,128

Of all the food, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that food-uncleanliness requires the size of an egg? R. Avahu said in the name of R. Elazar: "Of all the food that is eaten" — food that comes from food, i.e., a chicken egg. And R. Avahu himself says: "Of all the food that is eaten" — food that you can eat at once [i.e., in one swallow], and the sages estimated that the esophagus cannot contain more than the size of a chicken egg (Yoma 80a). 129

that is eaten - to exclude decayed food (Yerushalmi Terumoth 11:2). 130

upon which there comes water - From here it is derived that food upon which water has come is subject to uncleanliness, and food upon which water has not come is not subject to uncleanliness (*Chullin* 36a).¹³¹

upon which there comes water - I would think that this applied only to water that he collected. Whence do I derive that it applies even if it came down of itself? From: "upon which there comes" (Torath Cohanim).¹³²

upon which there comes water - This tells me only of water. Whence do I derive for inclusion dew, wine, oil, blood, honey, and milk? From: "and every drink." I might think that even mulberry juice and pomegranate juice and the juice of other fruits were included; it is, therefore, written: "water." Just as "water" is characterized by the absence of a qualifying epithet, so all liquids that are so characterized (Torath Cohanim). 133,134

which is drunk - to exclude stagnant water (Yerushalmi Terumoth 11:2). 135

in every vessel - Whence is it derived that if he filled them up to knead clay or to wash vessels [they still come under this ruling]? From: "upon which there comes." I might think that this applied even to water in holes, pits, and caves; it is, therefore, written: "vessel" — just as a vessel is removed from the ground, so all that is removed from the ground (Torath Cohanim). 136

shall be unclean - What is the intent of "unclean," "unclean"? The first "unclean" refers to the uncleanliness of liquids; the second, to the uncleanliness of food (*Pesachim* 18a).¹³⁷

11:35 And all that there shall fall of their carcass upon it shall be unclean; whether oven or stove, it shall be torn down. They are unclean, and they shall be unclean to you.

it shall be torn down - [I might think that tearing-down alone is acceptable; it is, therefore, written: "and they shall be unclean to you"—breaking, too, is acceptable. Why, then, is "tearing-down" stated? I might think that if it is built into the ground it becomes like the ground itself and does not acquire uncleanliness. We are, therefore, apprised that this is not so [(Shabbath 125a).138]

it shall be torn down - I might think that he *must* tear them down [even if he does not intend using them]; it is, therefore, written: "they shall be unclean" — they may be kept in their unclean state (*Torath Cohanim*).¹³⁹

and they shall be unclean to you - "to you" — to all that you need [in using them], including their handles (Chullin 118a). 140

and they shall be unclean to you - What is the intent of this? Is it not already written: "They are unclean"? This is meant to include both a prohibition on eating and a prohibition on the derivation of benefit. And any object which is banned by the Torah, it is forbidden to do business with (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 7:1). 141,142

and they shall be unclean to you - It was taught: R. Yossi b. Bun said: Kashuth [a type of grass] which was gathered together is considered connected for purposes of uncleanliness [i.e., one strand transfers its uncleanliness to the next], but not connected for purposes of sprinkling [i.e., the cleansing of one through the sprinkling of the purifying waters does not cleanse the other]. Why is there a difference between uncleanliness and sprinkling? R. Ila said: In respect to sprinkling it is written (Numbers 19:18): "and he shall sprinkle on the tent and on all the vessels" — on all that sustain the vessel [implying a discrete sprinkling for each component], whereas in respect to uncleanliness it is written: "to

you" — all that serves your needs [becomes unclean by transference] (Yerushalmi Pesachim 3:2). 143,144

11:36 But a spring or a pit where waters are gathered shall be clean; and he who touches their carcass shall be unclean.

But a spring - What is the intent of this? I might think that just as a spring cleanses with any amount [that covers the object], so a mikvah cleanses with any amount; it is, therefore, written: "But a spring" — a spring cleanses with any amount, but a mikvah cleanses with forty sa'ah (Torath Cohanim). 145

But a spring - It was taught: I might think that just as a spring cleanses through running waters, so a *mikvah* may cleanse through running waters; it is, therefore, written: "But a spring" — a spring cleanses through running waters, but a mikvah does not cleanse through running waters but through standing ones (Torath Cohanim). 146

But a spring - It was taught: I might think that even if he filled [up containers of water and carried them on his shoulders] and made a *mikvah* that it would be valid; it is, therefore, written: "a spring" — just as a spring is made by "Heaven," so a *mikvah* must be made by "Heaven" (*Ibid.*). 147

a spring or a pit - I might think that a pit in a boat [i.e., a cavity into which sea water is admitted] would be valid; it is, therefore, written: "a spring" — just as a spring is ground-based, a pit, too, must be ground-based (*Ibid.*). 148

where waters are gathered - Yaakov the heretic said to Rava: Let [immersion in] blood also be valid, for it is called "water," as it is written (*Deuteronomy* 15:23): "On the ground you shall pour it, as water." He answered: It is written: "But...a pit where waters are gathered" — waters, and nothing else (*Chullin* 84a). 149,150

shall be clean - It was taught there: If he positioned his hand or foot or vegetable leaves so that water should pass over them into containers [to serve as waters of purification in admixture with the ashes of the red heifer], it is invalid; if the coverings of reeds or nuts, it is valid. This is the rule: If the agent of transmission is susceptible of uncleanliness [as is a

human limb and edibles], it is invalid; if the agent of transmission is not susceptible of uncleanliness, it is valid. Whence is this derived? From: "But a spring or a pit where waters are gathered shall be clean" — their inception must be in cleanliness (Zevachim 25b). 151,152

11:37 And if there fall of their carcass on any seed of sowing which is to be sown, it is clean.

And if there fall - "And if there fall" — until there fall; to exclude a limb or flesh which are dangling from a beast and are attached only by a thread from the offering of carcass-uncleanliness (Chullin 127b). 153

on any seed of sowing - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "And if there fall of their carcass on any seed of sowing" — in the manner in which men take them out for sowing: wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, and lentils in their husks; from here it is derived that the "guardians" [i.e., the husks] combine [with the seeds themselves in constituting the minimum quantity] for lower-order uncleanliness [i.e., that of edibles, whose uncleanliness is non-transferable] (*Ibid.* 117b). 154

which is to be sown - There are three [extra] "sowings" written here; one [to include for combination in the minimum quantity for uncleanliness], the "guardian" of seeds; another, the "guardian" of trees; the third, the "guardians" of flesh, eggs, and fish (*Ibid.* 118b). 155, 156

11:38 And if water be placed upon a seed and aught of their carcass fall on it, it is unclean to you.

And if water be placed - R. Pappa asked: It is written: "ki yiten" [i.e., "if he place"] but it is read "ki yutan" [i.e., "if it be placed"]. How is this understood? [The connotation is] "if it be placed" in a manner corresponding to "if he place" — just as "if he place" implies volition, so "if it be placed" implies volition [i.e., he must acquiesce in its having been placed there] (Kiddushin 59b). 157

upon a seed - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "And if water be placed upon a seed" — just as seeds, which are not destined for higher-order uncleanliness [that of men and vessels] nevertheless require pre-

conditioning [through water for lower-order uncleanliness (that of edibles)], so, all that are not destined for higher-order uncleanliness require pre-conditioning (*Chullin* 121a). 158

it is unclean - It was taught: "And if water be placed upon a seed and aught of their carcass fall on it, it is unclean" — "it" is unclean, but it does not render its like [edible] unclean (*Pesachim* 14a). 159

it is unclean - It was taught: This tells me [of uncleanliness only in the instance] of water placed upon seed. Whence do I derive that the same applies to seed placed upon water? From: "it is unclean" — in any event (Torath Cohanim). 160

it is unclean to you - to all that serves your needs — to include its appurtenances [in its uncleanliness] (Chullin 118a). 161

11:39 And if there die of the beast which is to you to eat, he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening.

And if there die - It was taught: A carcass causes uncleanliness only when it is moist, and not when it is dry; for it is written: "And if there die" — as at the time of death (Niddah 56a). 162

of the beast - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: "And if there die of the beast" — there is that "of the beast" which causes uncleanliness, and there is that "of the beast" which does not cause uncleanliness. And which is that [the second]? A treifah [an organically defective animal] which was slaughtered (Zevachim 69b). 163

of the beast - It was taught: Whence is it derived that eiver min hachai [a limb torn from a living animal] causes [carcass] uncleanliness? R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: From: "And if there die of the beast" [even part of the beast] (Chullin 128b). 164

of the beast - It was taught: I might think that flesh which was separated from a living animal caused [carcass] uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "And if there die of the beast" — just as the beast is flesh, sinew and bone, so all that is flesh sinew and bone [i.e., a limb, and not flesh alone] (Ibid.). 165

of the beast, etc. - It was taught: "of the beast" — this subsumes an unclean beast; "which is to you to eat" — this denotes a clean beast. The unclean is hereby being likened to the clean, viz., just as the dead fœtus of a clean animal [that is slaughtered] is clean [in respect to carcass uncleanliness], so, that of an unclean animal is clean (*Ibid.* 70b). 166,167

which is to you - to all that serves your needs — to include its appurtenances [in its uncleanliness] (*Ibid.* 118a). 168

to you to eat - to include [in carcass uncleanliness] an animal born in its eighth month, which would not be fit if slaughtered [In view of its impending death, it is regarded as halachically dead while still alive, though it would have been "to you to eat" if found in the mother's stomach after she had been slaughtered] (Shabbath 136a). 169

he who touches its carcass - The Rabbis taught: "its carcass" — and not an intact marrow-bone. I might think this were true even if the bone had been pierced; it is, therefore, written: "he who touches" — where touching [in this case, of the marrow,] is possible, it is unclean; where touching is impossible, it is clean (Chullin 126a).^{170,171}

11:40 And he who eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes, and he shall be unclean until the evening. And he who bears its carcass shall wash his clothes, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And he who eats - What is the intent of: "And he who eats"? To establish the same quantity [for carcass uncleanliness] for touching and carrying as for eating. Just as the amount for eating is the size of an olive, so that for touching and bearing (Niddah 42b). 172,173

And he who eats of its carcass - It was taught: Whence is it derived that "swallowed" uncleanliness does not render one unclean? From: "And he who eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes." Are we not speaking [even] of one who ate [of the carcass] immediately before sunset, in spite of which Scripture states that he is clean [after sunset, in spite of the "swallowed" uncleanliness, which has not been digested] (Chullin 71a). 174,175

And he who bears - It was taught: Whence is it derived that bearing-uncleanliness obtains with a pierced marrow-bone, and not with one that is intact? From: "he who eats... and he who bears" — what applies to touching applies to bearing, and what does not apply to touching [viz., intact marrow-bone uncleanliness] does not apply to bearing (*Ibid.* 125a). 176

11:41 And every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth is detestable; it shall not be eaten.

And every creeping thing - to include gnats which had been filtered out of wine (*Ibid.* 67a).¹⁷⁷

creeping thing that creeps - It was taught: An egg whose white and yolk are intermixed is of a certainty that of a creeping thing. What is the halachic implication? Rava answered: That if it formed an embryo and he ate it, he receives stripes for: "creeping thing that creeps" (*Ibid.* 64a). 178

creeping thing that creeps - R. Huna said: One must not pour date-beer through wood chips in the evening, lest it [a creeping thing in the beer] be separated onto the wood and thence fall into his cup, so that [drinking therefrom] he would be in transgression of: "And every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth" (*Ibid.* 67a). 179

that creeps upon the earth - R. Yehudah said: One who eats a worm found in cabbage leaves receives stripes for: "creeping thing that creeps upon the earth" (Makkoth 16b). 180, 181

that creeps upon the earth - Abbaye said: If one ate a putitha [a kind of creeping thing that flies] he receives stripes four times [for four discrete transgressions: 1) "creeping thing that creeps upon the earth" 2) "it is detestable; it shall not be eaten" 3) "Do not make yourselves unclean with every creeping thing that swarms upon the earth" 4) "And every creeping thing that flies is unclean to you; they shall not be eaten"]; if he ate an ant, he receives stripes five times [the four above, and] for: "Every creeping thing" [including those that can move on water, like an ant] (Ibid.). 182

that creeps upon the earth - Shmuel said: If a cucumber swarmed worms while still rooted in the ground, it is forbidden because of: "creeping thing that creeps upon the earth" (Chullin 67b). 183

that creeps upon the earth - It was taught by one: "upon the earth"—to exclude the mites in lentils, the bugs in peas, and the worms in dates and figs — and, by another: to include the worms in the roots of olive trees and in the roots of grape-vines. And there is no dispute between the two. The first is speaking of the fruit [detached from the tree, so that whatever swarms within it is not regarded as creeping "upon the earth"] and the second, of the tree itself [all that swarms upon it being regarded as "upon the earth," just as the tree itself] (Chullin 67b). 184,185

it shall not be eaten - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: The eating of an olive-size of creeping things [in their living state] is punishable by stripes, "eating," [which is understood to connote at least the size of an olive,] being stated in that regard (Me'ilah 16b). 186

11:42 All that go upon the belly and all that go upon four, until all that are many-footed of all creeping things that creep upon the earth, you shall not eat them, for they are detestable.

All that go upon the belly - The Rabbis taught: "go upon the belly" — this refers to serpents; "All" — to include snails and their like (Chullin 67b). 187

the belly - The vav of "gachon" ["belly"] marks the mid-point of the letters of the Torah (Kiddushin 30a). 188

and all that go upon four - The Rabbis taught: "go upon four" — this refers to scorpions; "all that go" — to include beetles and the like (Chullin 67b). 189

until all that are many-footed. The Rabbis taught: "many-footed"—this is the centipede; "until all"—to include its like and what is like its like (*Ibid.*). 190, 191

you shall not eat them - "you shall not cause them to be eaten" — to exhort adults against [feeding them to] minors (Yevamoth 114a). 192

11:43 Do not make yourselves detestable with every creeping thing that creeps, and do not become unclean with them that you be unclean with them.

Do not make yourselves detestable - R. Kahana was standing before Rava when a locust crossed his mouth, upon which he said to him: Remove it, that it not be said: He ate it and transgressed: "Do not make yourselves detestable" (Shabbath 90b). 193,194

Do not make yourselves detestable - R. Acha said: One who constrains his bowels is in transgression of: "Do not make yourselves detestable." And R. Bibi b. Abbaye said: One who drinks from a blood-letter's horn is in transgression of: "Do not make yourselves detestable" (Makkoth 16b). 195

that you be unclean with them - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: A transgression stultifies a man's heart, as it is written: "and do not become unclean with them that you be unclean with them" — do not read it "venitmeitem" ["that you be unclean"], but "venitamtem" ["that you be stultified"] (Yoma 39b). 196

that you be unclean with them - The Rabbis taught: "and do not become unclean with them that you be unclean with them" — if a man defiles himself a little, he is caused to be greatly defiled; if he defiles himself below, he is defiled from on high; if he defiles himself in this world, he is defiled in the world to come (*Ibid.*). 197

11:44 For I am the L-rd your G-d. And you shall make yourselves holy, and you shall be holy, for I am holy. And you shall not make yourselves unclean with every creeping thing that swarms upn the earth.

And you shall make yourselves holy. The Rabbis taught: "And you shall make yourselves holy, and you shall be holy"—if a man sanctifies himself a little, he is caused to be greatly sanctified; if he sanctifies himself below, he is sanctified from on high; if he sanctifies himself in this world, he is sanctified in the world to come (*Ibid.*). 198

And you shall make yourselves holy - It was taught: "And you shall

make yourselves holy"—this refers to the preliminary waters [i.e., laving preceding the meal]; "and you shall make yourselves holy"—this refers to the latter waters [at the termination of the meal]; "for holy"—this refers to oil [with which one cleanses himself at the conclusion of the meal]; "I am the L-rd your G-d"—this refers to the recitation of Grace (Berachoth 53b). 199

And you shall make yourselves holy - R, Binyamin b. Yefeth said: All who sanctify themselves at the time of cohabitation will have male children, as it is written: "And you shall make yourselves holy, and you shall be holy," followed by (12:2): "If a woman give forth seed and bear a male" (Shevuoth 18b).²⁰⁰

for I am holy - What is the intent of "for I am holy"? Just as I am holy, you be holy; just as I am separate, you be separate (Torath Cohanim).²⁰¹

with every creeping thing that swarms - that swarms [i.e., that germinates], though it does not reproduce (*Ibid.*).²⁰²

11:45 For I am the L-rd, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt to be a G-d to you; and you shall be holy, for I am holy.

who brought you up - What is the intent of "who brought you up"? As it was taught in the school of R. Yishmael; for it was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: The Holy One Blessed be He said: Had I taken Israel out of Egypt for the sake of this thing alone [i.e., cleanliness vis à vis creeping things], it would have been sufficient for Me (Bava Metzia 61b). 203,204

who brought you up, etc. - What is the intent of the juxtaposition of the exodus from Egypt with creeping things? The Holy One Blessed be He said: I am the One who distinguished between the drop of the first-born and the drop of the non first-born; I am destined to exact payment from those who mix the intestines of unclean fish with those of clean fish and sell them to Jews (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁵

11:46 This is the law of the beast and the bird and every living creature that swarms in the water and every creature that creeps upon the earth.

This is the law, etc. - It was taught: Rebbi says: An ignoramus is not permitted to eat flesh, for it is written: "This is the law of the beast and the bird" — all who occupy themselves with the Law are permitted to eat the flesh of beast and bird, and all who do not occupy themselves with the Law are not permitted to eat the flesh of beast and bird (*Pesachim* 49b). 206

the law of the beast and the bird - Now in which law is beast similar to bird and bird similar to beast? The intent is to teach that just as a beast is slaughtered through *shechitah* [the cutting of the throat], so a bird is slaughtered through *shechitah*. But [why not say, then,] just as a beast [is ritually fit] if the greater part of the two [*shechitah* sites] have been severed, so a bird requires the greater part of the two to be severed? This is counter-indicated by "This" [i.e., only in this respect (*shechitah* in general) are they similar, but not in the other]. And R. Eliezer says: Just as a bird is rendered fit through the throat, so a peast is rendered fit through the throat (*Chullin* 27b). 207,208

the beast and the bird, etc. - Bar Kappara taught: "This is the law of the beast and the bird" — Scripture interjected "bird" between "beast" and fish [i.e., "that swarms in the water"]. It cannot be for the purpose of requiring [the severing of] two signs [for a bird as for a beast], for it is likened to a fish [which requires no slaughtering at all]; to exempt it from slaughtering entirely is impossible, for it is likened to a beast. How can this be reconciled? By positing [the severing of] one sign as the condition for its ritual fitness (Ibid.). 209-211

and every creature, etc. - Chagavim [a species of permitted locust] do not require shechitah, for they are mentioned after fish: "every living creature that swarms in the water" — these are fish; "and every creature that creeps upon the earth" — these are chagavim (Halachoth Gedoloth).²¹²

11:47 To distinguish between the unclean and between the clean, and between the animal that may be eaten and between the animal that may not be eaten.

To distinguish between the unclean - R. Chiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Yochanan: One who separates from his wife before the onset of her menses will have male children, as it is written: "To distinguish between

the unclean and between the clean," followed by (12:2): "If a woman give forth seed and bear a male" (Shevuoth 18b).²¹³

To distinguish between the unclean - R. Chiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Yochanan: All who pronounce the "Havdalah" [lit., "distinction," between the Sabbath and the days of the week] at the conclusion of the Sabbath will have male children, as it is written (10:10): "And to distinguish between the holy and between the profane," and: "to distinguish between the unclean and between the clean," followed by (12:2): "If a woman give forth seed and bear a male" (Ibid.).²¹⁴

and between the animal, etc. - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "between the animal that may be eaten and between the animal that may not be eaten" — these are the eighteen *treifoth* [invalidating organic defects] which were communicated to Moses at Sinai (*Chullin* 42b).²¹⁵

Tazria

- 12:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 12:2 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: If a woman give forth seed and bear a male, she shall be unclean seven days; as the days of her menstrual flow shall she be unclean.

Speak to the children of Israel - This tells me only of the children of Israel. Whence do I derive that proselytes and maidservants also become unclean in giving birth? From: "If a woman give forth seed" (Krituth 7b)."

Speak to the children of Israel - The children of Israel become unclean in giving birth, but gentiles do not become unclean in giving birth (*Torath Cohanim*).²

If a woman give forth seed and bear - [If she miscarries a fœtus, she assumes birth-uncleanliness] for it is written: "If a woman give forth seed and bear," which teaches us that even if she bears only as she has conceived [even though the child does not live], she assumes birth-uncleanliness (Niddah 27b).³

If a woman give forth seed and bear - Days of uncleanliness and of cleanliness are not observed for a child born through Caesarian section and no offering is thereupon required. Why so? For it is written: "If a woman give forth seed and bear"—if she bear whence she has conceived (*Ibid.* 40a).4

and bear a male - R. Yitzchak said in the name of R. Ami: If the woman ejaculates first, she bears a male; if the man ejaculates first, she bears a female, as it is written: "If a woman give forth seed and bear a male" (*Ibid.* 31a).⁵

and bear a male - "a male" — to include one who is born dead (Yerushalmi Pesachim 2:1).6

she shall be unclean - A Tanna taught in the presence of Rav: If one miscarried a fœtus with an unshaped body or an unshaped head, I might think she would assume birth-uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "If a woman give forth seed ... she shall be unclean ... (3): And on the eighth day he shall circumcise" — [birth-uncleanliness obtains] only where the eighth-day covenant obtains, to exclude an instance [such as the above] where the eighth-day covenant cannot obtain (Niddah 24b).

she shall be unclean - She is unclean, but not the child (Torath Cohanim).8

she shall be unclean seven days - The disciples asked R. Shimon b. Yochai: Why did Scripture ordain seven days of uncleanliness for a male and fourteen for a female? He answered: In the throes of childbirth, a woman vows not to cohabit with her husband again. If she bears a male, whom all rejoice in, she repents of her vow after seven days; if she bears a female, whom all are saddened in, she repents of it after fourteen days (Niddah 31b).9

she shall be unclean seven days - I might think seven days, whether consecutive or scattered; it is, therefore, written: "as the days of her menstrual flow shall she be unclean" — just as the days of menstrual uncleanliness are consecutive, so the days of birth-uncleanliness are consecutive (*Torath Cohanim*). 10

as the days of her mentrual flow - A woman who has just given birth is likened to a *niddah* [one with menstrual uncleanliness]; just as a *niddah* immerses herself [in a *mikvah* at the end of her *niddah* period] at night, so a woman who has given birth immerses herself at night [at the termination of the days of uncleanliness] (Rashi *Pesachim* 90b).¹¹

as the days of her menstrual flow - The [uncleanliness] days of birth are likened to the days of *niddah*. Just as the days of *niddah* are not susceptible of *zivah* uncleanliness [attendant upon a blood discharge during the eleven day period following the seven day period of *niddah* uncleanliness], and the seven-day cleanliness period [after *zivah*] cannot be concurrent with them [i.e., the days of *niddah*], in the same way, since

the days of birth-uncleanliness are not susceptible of zivah, the seven-day cleanliness period [for zivah] cannot be concurrent with them (Niddah 37b). 12

as the days of her menstrual flow - "her menstrual flow shall she be unclean" — to include the one who cohabited with her [during that period, as is the case with one who cohabits with a *niddah*, though "seven days" is stated here]; to include one who gives birth in her zivah period as requiring seven clean days [for zivah, over and above the uncleanliness days for birth] (*Ibid.* 35b).¹³

12:3 And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise the flesh of his foreskin.

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - on that day — even on the Sabbath (Shabbath 132a). 14

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - Rabbah said in the name of R. Assi: Every male whose mother is susceptible of birth-uncleanliness is circumcised on the eighth day, and every male whose mother is not susceptible of birth-uncleanliness [such as one delivered by caesarean section or the son of a gentile mother who converted after giving birth] is not circumcised on the eighth day [but, in the first instance, on the day of birth, and, in the second, on the day of his mother's conversion, though it precede the eighth day]; for it is written (2): "she shall be unclean seven days ... (3) And on the eighth day he shall circumcise" (*Ibid.* 135a).¹⁵

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - All of the day is valid for circumcision, as it is written: "And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise," but "The zealous are quick to do mitzvoth" [and they do so in the morning] (Pesachim 4a).¹⁶

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - Circumcision is not performed until sunrise, as it is written: "And on the eighth day he shall circumcise" (Megillah 20a).¹⁷

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - This tells me that only he who is circumcised on the eighth day must be circumcised in the daytime. Whence do I derive the same for one who is circumcised on the ninth day

[in the event of his having been born at twilight, in which case the counting is begun from the evening], the tenth day [in the event of his having been born at twilight on the eve of Sabbath, in which case he cannot be circumcised on the Sabbath, it possibly being the ninth day (only eighth-day circumcision countermanding the Sabbath)], the eleventh day [in the event of his having been born at twilight on the eve of a Sabbath followed by a festival, in which case, the festival, too, not being countermanded, he is circumcised on Monday], and on the twelfth day [in the event of his having been born at twilight on Wednesday preceding the two days of Rosh Hashanah on Thursday and Friday, in which case he must be circumcised on Sunday]? From: "And on the eighth day," even he who does not derive additional inclusions from "And," deriving them from "And the" (Yevamoth 72b). [8,19]

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - R. Shizvi said: A tumtum [one whose sexual organs are concealed] who was incised and found to be a male is not circumcised on the eighth day, for it is written: "and bear a male ... and on the eighth day he shall circumcise" — if it is [clearly] a male at the time of birth (Bava Bathra 127a).²⁰

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - The disciples asked R. Shimon b. Yochai: Why did Scripture ordain circumcision for the eighth day? He answered: So that all should not be rejoicing [at the ceremony] while his father and mother are sad [conjugal relations being forbidden until after the seven days of birth-uncleanliness] (Niddah 31b). 21,22

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - R. Chaggi asked in the presence of R. Yossi: It is written: "And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise." If he transgressed and did not circumcise [on that day], what is the halachah [i.e., Is he in transgression of: "do not delay"]? He answered: It is written (Deuteronomy 23:22): "When you vow a vow to the L-rd your G-d, do not delay to pay it" — something that can be repaid; to exclude something that cannot be repaid [such as the eighth day] (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:1).^{23,24}

And on the eighth day, he shall circumcise - From here it is derived that the father is commanded to circumcise his son (Yerushalmi Kiddushin 1:7).²⁵

the flesh of his foreskin - The Rabbis taught: The mitzvah of

circumcision countermands the injuction against cutting a leprous sore [if there be such a sore on the circumcision site], both in its time [the eighth day] and after its time, for it is written: "he shall circumcise the flesh of his foreskin" — "flesh," though there be a leprous lesion upon it (Shabbath 132b).²⁶

the flesh of his foreskin - The Rabbis taught: The [circumcision of the] foreskin of one who is certain to survive countermands the Sabbath [if the eighth day falls out upon it], and not that of one whose survival is in doubt, and not that of a hermaphrodite, or of one born at twilight, or of one born circumcised [in which case the "letting of the blood of the covenant" is not done on the Sabbath] (*Ibid.*). ^{27,28}

12:4 And thirty days and three days shall she sit in the blood of purification. All that is holy she shall not touch, and to the sanctuary she shall not come until the fulfillment of the days of her purification.

And thirty days - I might think "thirty," whether consecutive or scattered; it is, therefore, written: "day" [lit., "thirty day"] — just as a day is consecutive, so the thirty must be consecutive (Krituth 10a).²⁹

And thirty days and three days - What is the intent of this? I might think that if in the event of her bearing a female, where the days of her uncleanliness are [relatively] many [fourteen, as opposed to the seven for a male], the days of her cleanliness are many [sixty-six] — in the event of her bearing a male, where the days of uncleanliness are few, should it not follow that the days of cleanliness should be many? It is, therefore, written: "And thirty days and three days" (Torath Cohanim). 30

All that is holy - to include terumah (Yevamoth 75a).31

she shall not touch - Is this an exhortation against eating or against touching? Deduce it from: "and to the sanctuary she shall not come." The "holy" is being likened to the sanctuary. Just as the sanctuary involves the taking of the soul [the penalty for entering the sanctuary in a state of uncleanliness being kareth (cutting-off)], so, the "holy" involves the taking of the soul [and it is only the eating of sanctified food and not the touching of it which is punishable by kareth] As to Scripture referring

to eating by "touching," the intent is to equate touching with eating [in the sense that what may not be eaten may not be touched] (*Ibid.*). ³²⁻³⁴

and to the sanctuary she shall not come - It was taught: An unclean person who entered the sanctuary through the roof is not liable, for it is written: "and to the sanctuary she shall not come" — it is by way of "coming" that the Torah forbade it (Shevuoth 17b).³⁵

and to the sanctuary she shall not come - Ulla said in the name of Resh Lakish: If one who was unclean put his hand into the sanctuary, he receives stripes, for it is written: "All that is holy she shall not touch, and to the sanctuary she shall not come." Coming is being likened to touching: just as partial touching is called touching, so partial coming is called coming (Zevachim 32b).³⁶

12:5 And if she bear a female, then she shall be unclean two weeks, as in her menstrual state, and sixty days and six days shall she sit over her blood of purification.

And if she bear a female - "she bear" — to include a child whose sex is in doubt and a hermaphrodite (*Niddah* 40a).³⁷

then she shall be unclean two weeks - It is written "shivim" [seventy]. Let us say, then, that the writing is a determinant and the reading [shevuayim (two weeks)] is a determinant, so that forty-two days would be required [i.e., the total of half of each]? This is counter-indicated by: "as in her menstrual state" [two weeks approximating her menstrual state (one week) far more closely than seventy days] (Zevachim 38a). 38.39

as in her menstrual state - as in her menstrual state, and not as in her state of zivah, the implication being that there is a state of zivah in which she is clean. Which is that? Travail in the days of zivah [i.e., if she experienced labor pains in the days of zivah, as a result of which she saw blood, the blood is not regarded as blood of zivah, but as blood of cleanliness] (Niddah 36b).⁴⁰

shall she sit. The Rabbis taught: "shall she sit"—to include one who is in travail within the eighty day period for a female, all the blood that she sees being clean, until parturition takes place (*Ibid.* 38b).⁴¹

12:6 And when the days of her purification are fulfilled, for a son or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb in its first year for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering to the door of the tent of meeting, to the priest.

And when the days of her purification are fulfilled - It was taught: On the day of her fulfillment [i.e., if she delivered on the day of her fulfillment (the forty-first, for a male and the eighty-first, for a female)], she brings [two offerings, one for each birth], but [if she delivered] in the midst of her fulfillment, she does not bring [an additional offering, but only one offering at the end of the period, which covers all deliveries within that period]. I might think that she does not bring [an offering] for a delivery before the fulfillment, but she does bring for a delivery after the fulfillment and can cover both [the first and last delivery, though there be a delivery intervening]; it is, therefore, written: "And when the days of her purification are fulfilled" — on the day of fulfillment [i.e., since the offering for the last would fall out in the midst of the counting days for the second, no offering devolves upon it at that time] (Nazir 64b). 42-44

a lamb in its first year - The Rabbis taught: The year stated in respect to sanctified objects is a full year, as it is written: "she shall bring a lamb in its first year" — "its year," and not the calendar year (Erchin 18b).⁴⁵

and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove - R. Shimon says: Everywhere [in Scripture] turtle-doves are cited before young pigeons. I might think that this is because the first are preferred to the second; it is, therefore, written [here]: "and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove," to teach that both are equal (Krituth 28a).46

12:7 And he shall offer it before the L-rd and make atonement for her, and she shall be cleansed from the source of her blood. This is the law for her who bears, whether a male or a female.

And he shall offer it - What is the intent of this? [i.e., Why "it" if two offerings (the lamb and the pigeon or dove) are being brought]? I might

think that since two are required, both are indispensable [for her purification]; it is, therefore, written: "And he shall offer it" — one is indispensable, the other is not. Still, I would not know which. "And make atonement," however, tells me that it is the sin-offering which is indispensable, for "atonement" always appears in the context of a sin-offering (Torath Cohanim). 47,48

from the source of her blood - Five types of blood are unclean in a woman: red, black, bright-colored crocus, the color of earth-water, and the color of wine diluted with water. Why not red and no other? R. Avahu answered: Scripture states [here, lit.,]: "her bloods" [and (*Ibid.* 20:18)] "her bloods," giving us four, and "black" is really red blood that has congealed (*Niddah* 18a). 49,50

This is the law for her who bears - "her who bears" — whether of sound or unsound mind, the husband bringing the offering for the latter (*Nedarim* 35b).⁵¹

This is the law for her who bears - This teaches us that one offering may be brought for numerous deliveries [within the counting period of the first]. I might think she can bring an offering for a delivery before the day of fulfillment and for one after the day of fulfillment as one; it is, therefore, written: "This" [i.e., only the former is herein subsumed] (Krituth 9b). 52,53

whether a male or a female - to include one who miscarries a sandal-like fetus, a placenta, or an embryonic sac enclosing an articulated fœtus (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵⁴

12:8 And if she has not means enough for a lamb, then she shall take two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for a burnt-offering and one for a sin-offering, and the priest shall make atonement for her and she shall be clean.

then she shall take - R. Chisda said: The birds are designated [for their specific sacrificial function (sin-offering or burnt-offering)] only when taken by the owners or when offered by the priest, as it is written: "then she shall take two turtle-doves... one for a burnt-offering and one for a sin-offering," and (*Ibid.* 15:15): "Then the priest shall offer them, one

as a sin-offering and one as a burnt-offering" — either through the taking of the owner or the offering of the priest (Yoma 41a). 55,56

one for a burnt-offering and one for a sin-offering - [But is it not ruled that the sin-offering precedes the burnt-offering, as it is written (*Ibid*. 5:8): "and he shall sacrifice the one for the sin-offering first"? Rava answered: In the *reading* [(of our verse) as opposed to the actual offering] the burnt-offering precedes the sin-offering (*Zevachim* 90a).⁵⁷

and she shall be clean - It was taught: One lacking atonement [i.e., one whose offering has not yet been sacrificed], who immersed and rose [from his immersion], may eat ma'aser; when the sun goes down upon him, he may eat terumah; when he brings his offering, he may eat sanctified food. Whence is this derived? Rava said: Three verses are written [in this connection]: (Ibid. 22:6)): "He may not eat sanctified food unless he bathe his flesh in water," (Ibid. 7): "And when the sun goes down he shall be clean, and afterwards he may eat sanctified food," and, here: "and the priest shall make atonement for her and she shall be clean." How are these to be reconciled? The first allows [the eating of] ma'aser; the second, terumah; and the third, sanctified food (Yevamoth 74b). 58

and she shall be clean - All offerings, the blood of which was received by a priest lacking atonement [i.e., requiring an offering for his atonement] are invalid, as it is written: "and the priest shall make atonement for her and she shall be clean," from which we infer that until then she is unclean (Zevachim 19b).⁵⁹

and she shall be clean - It was taught: Cleanliness leads to purity, as it is written: "and the priest shall make atonement for her [also renderable as: "and the priest shall cleanse her"], and she shall be clean" [also renderable as: "and she shall be pure"] (Yerushalmi Shabbath 1:3).60

- 13:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying:
- 13:2 A man, if there be in the skin of his flesh a rising, or the like, or a bright spot, and it become in the skin of his flesh a

plague-spot of leprosy, then he shall be brought to Aaron the priest, or to one of his sons, the priests.

A man - It was taught: A one-day old infant is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness, as it is written: "A man, if there be in the skin of his flesh" — any stage of man (Erchin 3a).

if there be - from the giving of the Torah onwards (Horiyoth 10a).²

a rising - What is [the color of] a rising? That of white wool (Negaim 1:1).³

a rising - "se'rith" ["rising"] means "high," as it is written (Isaiah 2:14): "and upon all the high ["nisaoth"] hills" (Shevuoth 6b).

or the like - "safachath" ["the like"], means "adjunct," as it is written (I Samuel 2:36): "Join me ["sefacheini"], I pray you, to one of the priests' offices"] (Ibid.).

or the like - It was taught: Why was safachath placed between se'aith and bahereth? To teach that just as there is an adjunct [i.e., a lesser form] of se'aith, so there is a lesser form of bahereth (Ibid.).6

or a bright spot - "bahereth" ["a bright spot"] — bright as snow, as it is written (4): "And if it is a white bright spot" — it is white, and no other is white [to the same degree] (Ibid.). 7,8

or a bright spot - a deep white spot, as it is written (3): "and the appearance of the plague-spot is deeper than the skin," as the appearance of sunlight is deeper than its shadow (*Ibid.*).9

and it become - This ["it" instead of "they"] teaches us that they combine with each other, whether for exemption, confirmation, or quarantine (Torath Cohanim).¹⁰

in the skin of his flesh - to include even a part of the skin where hair does not grow (*Ibid.*).¹¹

in the skin of his flesh - in [i.e., relative to] the flesh of the observed. In this connection it was stated: A very bright spot seems dull in a [light-complected] German, and a dull spot in an Ethiopian seems bright (Negaim 2:1). 12,13

a plague-spot - This ["plague"] teaches us that it gives him pain, and others, too, observe that it gives him pain. [If not, it is not a "plague-spot"] (*Ibid.*). ^{14,15}

then he shall be brought - I might think that just as a woman shows a stain [on a piece of cloth to determine whether she is unclean, the source not requiring examination], so she may show [the stain of] a plague-spot; it is, therefore, written: "then he [the person himself] shall be brought" (Yerushalmi Niddah 2:7). 16

to one of his sons - This teaches us that even one priest may rule upon plague-spots [as opposed to judicial rulings, where three are required] (Sanhedrin 34b).¹⁷

of his sons, the priests - "of his sons" — to include those with blemishes; "the priests" — to exclude a non bona-fide priest (*Torath Cohanim*). 18

13:3 And the priest shall see the plague-spot in the skin of the flesh. If the hair in the plague-spot has turned white, and the appearance of the plague-spot is deeper than the skin of his flesh, then it is a plague-spot of leprosy; and the priest shall see it and he shall declare him unclean.

the plague-spot - His eyes must be upon it as he inspects him (Sanhedrin 34b). 19

in the skin of the flesh - This teaches us that he must see all the surrounding flesh with it as one (*Ibid.*).²⁰

If the hair in the plague-spot - The minimum of "hair" is two; "in the plague-spot" — to include hair that is [rooted] in it and [lies] outside it, and to exclude what is [rooted] outside it and lies in it (*Ibid.*).^{21,22}

in the plague-spot has turned white - From here it was derived: [If there are] two hairs, their roots black and their tops white, he is clean; their roots white and their tops black, he is unclean (*Ibid.*).²³

has turned white - and not if it was white before [the appearance of the plague-spot]. From here it was derived: If the bright spot preceded the

white hair, he is unclean, and if the white hair preceded the bright spot, he is clean (Negaim 4:10 and Torath Cohanim).²⁴

has turned white - and not red, and not green, and not black, and not yellow (*Ibid.*).²⁵

and the appearance of the plague-spot is deeper - its appearance is deeper, but in actuality it is not deeper (*Ibid.*).²⁶

and the priest shall see it - I might think that he should not [rule on two plague-spots at the same time and] tell him: You are quarantined for this one and confirmed in this one, or confirmed in this one and in this one; it is, therefore, written: "plague-spot ... and he shall see it," "leprosy ... and he shall see it" (*Ibid.*).²⁷

and the priest shall see it - "and he shall see it," all as one, so that if it were at the tip of his nose or at the tip of his finger, slanting down on both sides, he is not unclean (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁸

and he shall declare him unclean - He declares him unclean, and not one who plucks out the signs of uncleanliness before he comes to the priest (*Ibid.*).²⁹

13:4 And if it is a white bright spot in the skin of his flesh, and its appearance is not deeper than the skin, and its hair has not turned white, then the priest shall quarantine the plague-spot for seven days.

And if it is a white bright spot. This tells me only of a bright spot. Whence do I derive for inclusion the other types? From: "And if" [connoting an extension of inclusion] (Ibid.).³⁰

And if it is a white bright spot - it is white, and no other is white [to the same degree]. From here it is derived that the bahereth is as bright as snow (Shevuoth 6b).³¹

then the priest shall quarantine the plague-spot for seven days - [This refers to] the first seven days (Torath Cohanim). 32

13:5 And the priest shall see him on the seventh day; and if the plague-spot appears as it did before, if it did not spread in the skin, then the priest shall quarantine him for a second seven days.

on the seventh day - in the daytime, and not at night. I might think that every daytime observation is valid; it is, therefore, written (*Ibid.* 12): "to all the sight of the eyes of the priest"; just as with the eyes of the priest, darkened sight is excluded, so with the day, a dark day is excluded (*Torath Cohanim*). ^{33,34}

a second seven days - This teaches us that the seventh day appertains both to what precedes [i.e., the last of the first seven] and to what follows [i.e., the first of the second seven] (*Ibid.*).³⁵

13:6 And the priest shall see him on the seventh day again; and if the plague-spot is dim, and the plague-spot has not spread in the skin, then the priest shall declare him clean; it is a mispachath [a type of clean plague-spot]. And he shall wash his clothes, and he is clean.

And the priest shall see him again - This teaches us that the same priest who saw him the first time sees him the second time (*Ibid.*).³⁶

and if the plague-spot is dim - I might think it must be dimmer than all four types of plague-spots; it is, therefore, written: "the plague-spot" — if it is dimmer than its original appearance [he is clean] (*Ibid.*).³⁷

and if the plague-spot is dim - If it was bright and dimmed, it is as if it never was bright; "the plague-spot" — if it was dim and brightened, it is as if it never was dim; "and it did not spread" — if it was contracted and spread, it is as if it never was contracted; "the plague-spot" — if it spread and then contracted, it is as if it never spread (*Ibid.*). 38

it is a mispachath - even if its appearance changed (Ibid.).39

And he shall wash his clothes - so that he not render things unclean by lying or sitting on them or on entering [the house] (*ibid.*).⁴⁰

and he is clean - What is the intent of: "and he is clean" [as opposed to: "and he shall be clean"]? He is clean now, entrance-uncleanliness not taking effect retroactively [if the spot later becomes unclean] (Megillah 8b).⁴¹

13:7 And if the *mispachath* spreads in the skin after he has shown himself to the priest for his cleansing, then he shall show himself a second time to the priest.

And if the mispachath spreads - This tells me [that it is unclean] only if it spreads in its original appearance. Whence do I derive that this is so even if it does not spread in its original appearance [but in another of one of the four types of plague-spots]? From: [lit.,] "spreads, spreads" — in any event (Torath Cohanim).⁴²

after he has shown himself to the priest - I might think that the spreading is unclean from the beginning [i.e., as soon as it begins, even before the priest sees it]; it is, therefore, written: "after he has shown himself" (*Ibid.*).43

for his cleansing - I might think that if the priest sees it spreading [the first time he sees him] he should address himself to it [in the context of the laws of spreading]; it is, therefore, written: "for his cleanliness" — he does not address himself to it [i.e., the spreading] until he sees him [for the purpose of bringing him] from a state of uncleanliness to a state of cleanliness [i.e., the second time he sees him, as opposed to the first time, when he is not yet in a state of uncleanliness] (Ibid.).44

13:8 And the priest shall see; if the *mispachath* has spread in the skin, then the priest shall declare him unclean. It is leprosy.

the mispachath has spread - This teaches us that the spreading renders unclean only in the shades of the four types of plague-spots in which the source [the root of the plague-spot] renders unclean [and not in a dimmer shade of whiteness] (*Ibid.*).⁴⁵

13:9 A plague of leprosy, if it be in a man, then he shall be brought to the priest.

if it be in a man - to include one who comes with white over his whole body as requiring healing from his uncleanliness (*Ibid.*). 46

13:10 And the priest shall see, and, behold, a white rising in the skin, and it has turned the hair white, and the healthiness of healthy flesh within the rising,

and behold, a rising - If they called the priest to inspect one plague-spot, and there erupted another plague-spot, whence is it derived that he examines it? From: "And the priest shall see, and, behold [connoting something novel], a white rising" (Ibid.).⁴⁷

and it has turned - only if it has turned [the hair white], and not the neighboring spot (*Ibid.*).⁴⁸

and it has turned - If all of it [i.e., a fully grown (for purposes of uncleanliness) plague-spot] has turned it white, and not part of it; "and it has turned" — if all of it has turned all of it [two hairs, the minimum requirement for uncleanliness] white, and not if all of it has turned part of it [one hair] white (*Ibid.*). 49,50

and the healthiness of healthy flesh - I might think that any amount [of healthy flesh sufficed]; it is, therefore, written: "hair white and the healthiness of healthy flesh"; just as white hair indicates the size of two hairs, so the healthy flesh must occupy the space of two [by two] hairs (*Ibid.*).⁵¹

healthy flesh - healthy flesh, and not a boil, and not white scurf (Ibid.).52

within the rising - I might think that the white hair could be on one side and the healthy flesh on the other side [outside of the rising itself]; it is, therefore, written: "within the rising" — it must be encircled by the rising (*Ibid.*).⁵³

within the rising - [healthy flesh must be within the rising] and not a boil; "within the rising" — and not within white scurf (*Ibid.*). 54

13:11 It is old leprosy in the skin of his flesh. And the priest shall declare him unclean; he shall not quarantine him, for he is unclean.

leprosy - This is the prototype for all leprosy as requiring a garis [the size of a Cilician bean, for uncleanliness (see below)] (*Ibid.*).55

old leprosy - I might think that he is not unclean unless there be white hair and healthy flesh; it is, therefore, written: "It is old leprosy [i.e., the plague-spot is considered leprous even without these]. If so, why are white hair and healthy flesh cited? To teach us that the plague-spot is not unclean unless it is big enough to contain [the size of two] white hairs [surrounding the healthy flesh on all sides] and [the size of] healthy flesh [an additional two by two hairs, the sum total being the size of a garis] (Ibid.). 56,57

It is old leprosy - This teaches us that it is unclean, in any sequence [i.e., whether the rising or bright spot appear before the healthy flesh or the healthy flesh appear before the others (old leprosy)] (*Ibid.*).⁵⁸

he shall not quarantine him - This teaches us that a confirmed leper is not quarantined [for a spot which erupted within the period of his confirmation]. Whence do we derive that a quarantined leper is not confirmed [i.e., a priest is not called in during the period of his quarantine to examine what seems to be a spot of confirmed leprosy] and that a quarantined leper is not quarantined [i.e., a priest is not called in during the period of his quarantine to examine what seems to be a spot calling for quarantine]? From: "he shall not quarantine him, for he is unclean" — everyone who has been declared unclean is not to be attended [for new eruptions within that period] (*Ibid.*). ^{59,60}

13:12 And if there blossom, blossom, the leprosy in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of the plague-spot from his head until his foot, to all the sight of the eyes of the priest,

And if there blossom, blossom - This tells me only of its blossoming in all of him at once. Whence do I derive the same rule for its blossoming little

by little? From: "And if there blossom, blossom" — in any manner (*Ibid.*).⁶¹

And if there blossom, blossom - This tells me only [of blossoming, similar to that in flowers] from bottom to top. Whence do I derive the same rule for [blossoming] from top to bottom? From: "And if there blossom, blossom" — in any manner (*Ibid.*).62

And if there blossom, blossom - This tells me only [of blossoming] from the unclean one [i.e., the unclean plague-spot, viz., "leprosy"] to the clean one. Whence do I derive the same rule for [blossoming] from the clean one to the unclean one? From: "And if there blossom, blossom"—in any manner (*Ibid.*).63

blossom the leprosy - "the leprosy" — to include the other types [and not just the "rising" that is being spoken of here] (*Ibid.*).⁶⁴

and the leprosy cover - the leprosy, and not white scurf (Ibid.).65

all the skin of the plague-spot - skin which is susceptible of a plague-spot — to exclude a "rebellious" boil or burn (*Ibid.*).⁶⁶

from his head until his foot - "from his head," but not including his head; "until his feet," but not including his feet (Erchin 18b).67

to all the sight - to exclude the inside of the buttocks (Torath Cohanim). 68

to all the sight of the eyes - to exclude a blind priest from the examination of plague-spots (Sanhedrin 34b).69

to all the sight of the eyes of the priest - A priest who is blind in one eye or one whose vision has dimmed is not to examine plague-spots, as it is written: "to all the sight of the eyes of the priest" (Negaim 2:3).⁷⁰

13:13 And the priest shall see, and, behold, the leprosy has covered all of his flesh, then he shall declare the plague-spot clean; all of it has turned white — it is clean.

and, behold, the leprosy has covered - "the leprosy" — to include [its blossoming into] the other shades [and not just that of "the rising" which is being spoken of here] (Torath Cohanim).⁷¹

all of his flesh - to include that between his fingers and toes. (a variant interpretation): until it blossoms in all of him (*Ibid.*).^{72,73}

all of it has turned white - R. Yitzchak said: The son of David [the Messiah] will not come until all of the kingdom turns to heresy. Rava said: Whence is this derived? From: "all of it has turned white [the color of leprosy] — it is clean" (Sanhedrin 97a).⁷⁴

it is clean - it is clean, but what blossoms from a clean plague-spot is not clean, but unclean (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷⁵

13:14 But on the day that there appear in it healthy flesh, he shall be unclean.

But on the day that there appear in it - There is a day that it is inspected and there is a day that it is not inspected. From here it was derived: A groom is given the seven days of the [marriage] feast [without inspection, if there erupted a plague-spot in] him, his house, or his garment. Similarly, on a festival, one is given the seven days of the festival (*Ibid.*). 76,77

that there appear in it - to exclude [its appearing in] the head, in the beard, or in a "rebellious" boil, burn, or blister (*Ibid.*).⁷⁸

healthy flesh. It is written here: "healthy flesh," and, above (10): "healthy flesh." Just as there, the size of a lentil [(amounting to the size of two hairs) is required for uncleanliness], here, too, the size of a lentil (*Ibid.*)."

13:15 And the priest shall see the healthy flesh, and he shall declare him unclean. The healthy flesh is unclean; it is leprosy.

and he shall declare him unclean - to include [his being declared unclean not only in the instance of the appearance of the healthy flesh after having been pronounced clean by virtue of blossoming following a declaration at first inspection of uncleanliness because of healthy flesh within the plague-spot, but even] after the [pronunciation of "clean"] following blossoming of a confirmed healthy-flesh plague-spot at a later inspection,

following blossoming of a confirmed white-hair plague-spot at the initial or at a later inspection, following blossoming of a confirmed spreading plague-spot at the end of the first or the second week, following blossoming after [reappearance of an uncleanliness sign upon] exemption [by virtue of being found clean at the end of the second week], or following blossoming after quarantine (*Ibid.*).80

is unclean - it is unclean, but if healthy flesh returned to the limb tips of one declared unclean by being found entirely white at first inspection, he is not unclean, but clean (*Ibid.*).⁸¹

13:16 Or if the healthy flesh return and change back to white, then he shall come to the priest.

Or if the healthy flesh return - This comes to teach us that limb tips which were revealed and then again covered [by white] are clean. Whence is it derived that this is so even with a hundred repetitions of the same? From: "Or if it return" [instead of: "If it] return" (Ibid.). 82,83

13:17 And the priest shall see him, and, behold, the plague-spot has turned to white, then the priest shall declare the plague-spot clean; he is clean.

and, behold, the plague-spot has turned - to include [his being declared clean not only in the instance of the appearance of the white after having been pronounced unclean by virtue of the appearance of healthy flesh following a declaration at first inspection of cleanliness because of complete whiteness, but even] after the [pronunciation of "unclean"] following the remission of the blossoming of a confirmed healthy-flesh plague-spot at a later inspection, following the remission of the blossoming of a confirmed white-hair plague-spot at the initial or at a later inspection, following the remission of the blossoming of a confirmed spreading plague-spot at the end of the first or the second week, following the remission of the blossoming after [reappearance of an uncleanliness sign upon] exemption [by virtue of being found clean at the end of the second week], or following remission of the blossoming after quarantine (Ibid.).84

he is clean - "he is clean," but if one comes completely white at the beginning [i.e., if he was completely white from the very beginning, as opposed to his having turned completely white through the spreading of the plague-spot] he is not clean, but unclean (Ibid.).85

13:18 And flesh, if there be in it, in its skin, a boil, and it be healed,

And flesh, etc. - Chezkiah said: A man's prayer is not heard unless he makes his heart [soft] like flesh, as it is written (*Isaiah* 66:23): "all flesh will come to bow down, etc." R. Zeira said: Of flesh it is written: "and it be healed"; of man [who does not make his heart like flesh] it is not written: "and he be healed" (*Sotah* 5a). 86,87

in it, in its skin - This tells me only of a boil which has room to spread. Whence do I derive the same rule for a boil which does not have room to spread? From: "if there be in it, in its skin" — even in all of it (*Torath Cohanim*).^{88,89}

in it, in its skin - This tells me only of an instance of part-boil, part-plague-spot; part-boil, all plague-spot; part plague-spot, all boil. Whence do I derive for inclusion all boil, all plague-spot [where there is no room for spreading]? From: "in it, in its skin" — even in all of it (*Ibid.*).90

a boil - This tells me only of a boil which arose of itself. Whence do I derive for inclusion as a boil the result of a blow from a stick, a stone, or peat, [of bathing in] the hot springs of Tiberias, or of anything which is not caused by fire? From: "boil" [and, again (19)] "boil," implying extension of inclusion (Torath Cohanim).⁹¹

a boil, and it be healed - If [only] "boil" [were written], I would think that a "rebellious" [active] one were intended; it is, therefore, written: "and it be healed." If: "and it be healed," I would think that it must have formed a scab; it is, therefore, written: "boil." How is this to be reconciled? It has healed and not healed [i.e., it has formed a peel, but not a scab] (Ibid.). 92

13:19 And if there be in the place of the boil a white rising or a bright spot, then it shall be shown to the priest.

in the place of the boil a white rising - The boil must precede the rising, and not the rising, the boil (*Ibid.*).⁹³

a white rising, etc. - This teaches us that it causes uncleanliness by itself [i.e., white alone without intermixture]; "a bright spot, white-reddish" — this teaches us that it causes uncleanliness through intermixture. Whence do I derive the interchangeability of these qualifications? From (20): "a plague-spot of leprosy" (*Ibid.*). 94-96

13:20 And the priest shall see, and, behold, its appearance is lower than the skin, and its hair has turned white, then the priest shall declare him unclean. It is a plague-spot of leprosy; it has blossomed in the boil.

its appearance is lower - Whence do we derive for inclusion the level and the elevated [and not only the lower]? From (21): "and it is not lower than the skin" (*Ibid.*). 97

it has blossomed in the boil - in the boil, and not in the skin of the flesh, and not in the skin of the burn (Torath Cohanim). 98

13:21 And if the priest see it, and, behold, there is no white hair in it, and it is not lower than the skin, and it is dim, then the priest shall quarantine him for seven days.

And if the priest see it - all of it as one (Ibid.).99

there is no white hair in it - "there is not in it" — neither in it, nor in a strand projecting from it (*Ibid.*). 100

13:22 And if it spreads in the skin, the priest shall declare him unclean; it is a plague-spot.

And if it [lit.,] spreads, spreads - What is the intent of this? Because it is written (27): "And the priest shall see him on the seventh day. If it has spread in the skin, etc.," I might think that a spreading renders him unclean only on the seventh day. Whence do I derive that the same is true

for the eighth, ninth, and tenth day? From: "spreads, spreads" — in any case (*Ibid.*). 101,102

And if it spreads, spreads - If he were confirmed through white hair, and the white hair disappeared and then returned; and, similarly, through a spreading: at first inspection, at the end of a week, after exemption — where he was confirmed through the spreading and the spreading disappeared and then returned — and, similarly, through white hair, at the end of the first or the second week, or after exemption — in respect to all of these instances it is written: "And if it spreads, spreads" [i.e., he is unclean in any event] (Ibid.). 103

the priest shall declare him unclean - "him," [if his uncleanliness is] a certainty, he declares unclean, and he does not declare unclean in an instance of doubt (*Ibid.*). 104

13:23 And if in its place the bright spot stands; if it does not spread, then it is the peel of the boil, and the priest shall declare him clean.

And if in its place - [lit., "if beneath it"] the place beneath itself [where] it spreads [i.e., on the boil]. It does not spread [vis à vis uncleanliness] on the skin of the flesh and on the skin of the burn [If it does, it is clean] (*Ibid.*). 105

it is the peel of the boil - forming a membrane similar to a garlic peel (*Ibid.*). 106

it is the peel of the boil - its locus must be peel-domed and distinctly defined (*Ibid.*), 107

and the priest shall declare him clean - If his cleanliness is a certainty, he declares him clean, and not if it is in doubt (*Ibid.*). 108

13:24 Or flesh, if there be in its skin a burn by fire, and the healthy [healed] flesh of the burn be a bright spot, white-reddish or white,

Or flesh, etc. - This [i.e., the fact that boil and burn are discussed

independently and not jointly] teaches us that boil and burn do not combine with each other [to form the minimum amount for uncleanliness] (*Ibid.*). 109

if there be in its skin - This tells me only of a burn which has room to spread. Whence do I derive the same rule for a burn which does not have room to spread? From: "if there be in its skin" — even in all of it (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁰

if there be in its skin - This tells me only of an instance of part-burn, part bright spot; part-burn, and bright spot; part bright spot, all burn. Whence do I derive for inclusion all burn, all bright spot? From: "in its skin" (18) [comparison with boil], for inclusion [in the same law (see commentary thereon)] (*Ibid.*).¹¹¹

a burn by fire - This tells me only of his being burned by fire. Whence do I derive the same rule for [his being burned by] a coal, ashes, boiling lime, boiling gypsum, and anything else that comes from a flame, including water heated by fire? From: "burn" [a burn by fire"] - "burn" ["flesh of the burn"], for [extension of] inclusion (Pesachim 75a). 112

a burn by fire - I might think that only a "rebellious" [unhealed] burn were intended. It is, therefore, written: "and the healthy flesh of the burn." [If the latter alone were written] I might think that it must form a scab; it is, therefore, written: "a burn by fire." How is this to be reconciled? It healed and did not heal [i.e., It formed a peel, but not a scab] (Torath Cohanim).¹¹³

13:25 And the priest shall see it, and, behold, the hair has turned white in the bright spot, and its appearance is deeper than the skin, it is leprosy; it has blossomed in the burn. And the priest shall declare him unclean; it is a plague-spot of leprosy.

and its appearance is deeper - How much deeper must the appearance be? As the appearance of sunlight is "deeper" than its shadow (Shevuoth 6b).¹¹⁴

- 13:26 And if the priest see it, and, behold, there is not in the bright spot a white hair, and it is not lower than the skin, and it is dim, then the priest shall quarantine him for seven days.
- 13:27 And the priest shall see him on the seventh day. If it has spread in the skin, then the priest shall declare him unclean; it is a plague of leprosy.
- a plague of leprosy What is the intent of "leprosy," "leprosy," "leprosy" three times [once here and twice in (25)]? "leprosy" requiring the size of a garis [a Cilician bean]; "leprosy" to render what is stated in respect to a rising [i.e., "a boil"] subject to a bright spot, and what is stated in respect to a bright spot [i.e., "a burn"] subject to a rising; "leprosy" to render what is stated in respect to boils [i.e., its laws] as applicable to burns, and what is stated in respect to burns as applicable to boils (Torath Cohanim). 115-118

it is a plague of leprosy - What is the intent of "it," "it," — three times [once here and twice in (25)]? "it" — it [unlike a skin plague-spot] is not rendered unclean by the eruption of living flesh, whether at first inspection, at the end of a week of quarantine, or after exemption]; "it" — to exclude the spreading of white scurf at the end of a week of quarantine or after exemption; "it" — it has no fifth shade [aside from the four indicated] (*Ibid.*). 119-122

13:28 And if in its place the bright spot stands, not spreading in the skin, and it is dim, then it is the rising of the burn; and the priest shall declare him clean, for it is the peel of the burn.

the peel of the burn - forming a membrane similar to a garlic peel (*Ibid.*). 123

13:29 And a man or a woman, if there be in it a plague-spot — in the head or in the beard,

And a man or a woman - This tells me only of a man or a woman. Whence do I derive for inclusion a tumtum [one whose sex is in doubt] or a hermaphrodite? From: "or" (Ibid.).¹²⁴

if there be in it - to include a blanched spot within a blanched spot [separated from the first by a column of hair] — these are the words of R. Akiva (*Ibid.*).¹²⁵

in the head or in the beard - This teaches us that the hair of the head and the beard do not combine with each other [vis à vis the minimum size for uncleanliness]. I might think that though they do not combine they can spread from one to the other [vis à vis "spreading" uncleanliness]; it is, therefore, written (30): "the leprosy of the head or the beard" — just as they do not combine with one another, so they do not spread from one to the other (*Ibid.*). 126-128

13:30 And the priest shall see the plague-spot; and if its appearance is deeper than the skin and there is in it a thin yellow hair, then the priest shall declare him unclean. It is a blanched spot; it is the leprosy of the head or the beard.

and its appearance is deeper - Whence do we derive for inclusion the level and the elevated [and not only the "deeper"]? From (31): "and, behold, its appearance is not deeper than the skin." Why, then, is it stated: "and its appearance is deeper"? I might think that if a man blanched it, it would be unclean; it is, therefore, written: "and its appearance is deeper" — by the hands of Heaven (*Ibid.*). 129,130

yellow hair - and not green, and not red, and not white (Ibid.). 131

thin - "stricken" short [and not just thin] — these are the words of R. Akiva (*Ibid.*).¹³²

It is a blanched spot - I might think that this is an addition to the four shades [of plague-spot] in the skin of the flesh. It is, therefore, written: "then the priest shall declare him unclean. It is a blanched spot" (*Ibid.*).¹³³

It is a blanched spot - I might think that a bright spot would cause uncleanliness in the head and in the beard; it is, therefore, written: "It is a

blanched spot; it is the leprosy of the head, etc."—the only uncleanliness of head and beard is that of blanched spots (*Ibid.*). 134-135

13:31 And if the priest see the plague-spot of the blanched area, and, behold, its appearance is not deeper than the skin, and there is no black hair in it, then the priest shall quarantine the plague-spot of the blanched area for seven days.

the plague-spot of the blanched area - What is the intent of: "the plague-spot of the blanched area"? The blanched spot is being compared to a plague-spot. Just as a plague-spot is not less than a garis [the size of a Cilician bean], so a blanched spot [to be unclean] must be a garis. And, by the repetition of: "the plague-spot of the blanched area," a plague-spot is being compared to a blanched spot. Just as with a blanched spot, the spreading is not within it, so with a plague-spot, the spreading is not within it (Ibid.). 136,137

black hair - Whence do we derive for inclusion green hair and red hair? From: "hair" [implying any color]. Why, then, is black stated? Black saves [from uncleanliness], and yellow does not save (*Ibid.*). ^{138,139}

there is no black hair in it - It must be surrounded by it to render it unclean. From here it is derived (Negaim 10:6): If there were two blanched spots alongside each other, a column of hair separating them, if [that column were breached] from one locus, he is unclean; if from both loci, he is clean [the remainder of the column being regarded as "surrounded" in the latter instance, but not in the former] (Ibid.). 140,141

there is no black hair in it - And if there is, he is exempt (Ibid.). 142

13:32 And the priest shall see the plague-spot on the seventh day, and, behold, if the blanched spot has not spread, and there was not in it a yellow hair, and the appearance of the blanched spot is not deeper than the skin,

and there was not in it a yellow hair - R. Yehudah says: It is not written: "There did not 'turn in it into a yellow hair'," but: "there was not in it"—

[the implication being that] if a yellow hair preceded the blanched spot, he is unclean (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁴³

13:33 And he shall be shaven; but the blanched spot he shall not shave. And the priest shall quarantine the blanched spot a second seven days.

And he shall be shaven - This marks the mid-point of the verses in the Torah (Kiddushin 30a). 144

And he shall be shaven - By any man [though he not be a priest], by any instrument, and though he be a Nazirite [who, otherwise, is not permitted to shave]. I might think that the Nazirite's mitzvah to shave [at the termination of his Nazir period] countermanded the injunction against shaving the blanched spot in an instance of doubt [as to whether it is, indeed, a blanched spot]; it is, therefore, written: "but the blanched spot he shall not shave" [i.e., in any instance, one of certainty or one of doubt] (Torath Cohanim). 145,146

but the blanched spot, etc. - What does it contain? Why, then, is the shaving countermanded? The intent is that the perimeter of the blanched spot not be shaved. How is this effected? He shaves outside it and leaves a border of two hairs in depth so that any spreading will be perceived (*Ibid.*). 147,148

but the blanched spot, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one who plucks signs of uncleanliness [in this case, yellow hair] from his blanched spot transgresses a negative commandment? From: "but the blanched spot he shall not shave" (*Ibid.*). 149

13:34 And the priest shall see the blanched spot on the seventh day. And, behold, if the blanched spot has not spread in the skin, and its appearance is not deeper than the skin, then the priest shall declare him clean, and he shall wash his clothes, and he shall be clean.

- 13:35 And if the blanched spot has spread in the skin after he has been declared clean,
- 13:36 Then the priest shall see him, and, behold, the blanched spot has spread in the skin, then the priest shall not seek out the yellow hair; he is unclean.

he is unclean - It was taught: Whence is it derived that yellow hair may return after the exemption? From: "then the priest shall not seek out the yellow hair; he is unclean" (*Ibid.*). 150

he is unclean - It was taught: Whence is it derived that yellow hair renders unclean without spreading, and spreading renders unclean without yellow hair? From: "then the priest shall not seek out the yellow hair; he is unclean" (*Ibid.*). 151

13:37 And if in his eyes the blanched spot has remained as it was and black hair has sprouted in it, then the blanched spot has been healed; he is clean. And the priest shall declare him clean.

And if in his eyes the blanched spot has remained as it was - This tells me only of his [the priest's] own eyes? Whence do I derive for inclusion the eyes of his son or the eyes of his disciple? From: "And if in his eyes the blanched spot has remained the same" [not "the priest's eyes," but "his eyes" being stated] (*Ibid.*). 152

and black hair has sprouted in it - This tells me only of what sprouted at the end [of the quarantine period] and what appeared in the beginning [at the initial examination, as signaling cleanliness]. Whence do I derive the same for what sprouted in the beginning and what appeared [i.e., what was left over] at the end? From: "hair" - "hair," connoting extension of inclusion (*Ibid.*).¹⁵³

has sprouted in it - Though it not be surrounded within it (Ibid.). 154

then the blanched spot has been healed - but not if a blanched spot

appeared within [the sprouted hair of] the [original] blanched spot (Ibid.). 155

he is clean - Though the black hair disappears, he remains clean (Ibid.). 156

he is clean - If: "he is clean," I might think that he can exempt himself and go [i.e., relying on his own observation]; it is, therefore, written: "And the priest shall declare him unclean." If: "And the priest shall declare him unclean," I might think that if the priest [mistakenly] pronounced one who was unclean, clean, he remained clean; it is, therefore, written: "clean. And the priest shall declare him clean" [implying that the declaration is valid only if he is actually clean] (Ibid.). 157,158

- 13:38 And a man or a woman, if there be in the skin of their flesh, bright spots, bright spots, white,
- 13:39 Then the priest shall see, and, behold, if in the skin of their flesh there are dim white bright spots, it is white scurf that has blossomed in the skin; he is clean.

it is white scurf ... he is clean - This teaches us that white scurf is clean. I might think that it does not create uncleanliness through its source, but does create uncleanliness through spreading; it is, therefore, written: "has blossomed ... he is clean." I might think that it rendered clean a bright spot which issued from it; it is, therefore, written: "it" [and not an issuing bright spot] (Ibid.). 159-161

13:40 And a man, if the hair of his head fall out, he is bald; he is clean.

if the hair of his head fall out - to include the beard. If so, why is "his head" stated? If his head [balds] he is clean, [the non-balding of] his beard not negating [the cleanliness] (*Ibid.*). 162,163

he is bald - Whence is it derived that if there were a blanched spot on his

head and his entire head became blanched that he is clean? From: "he is bald" (*Ibid.*). 164

13:41 And if from the front of his face his head bald, he is forehead-bald; he is clean.

from the front of his face - This tells me only of the front of his face. Whence do I derive the temples on either side for inclusion? From: "And if from the front of his face" (*Ibid.*). 165

13:42 And if there be in the back baldness or in the front baldness a white-reddish plague spot, it is blossoming leprosy in his back baldness or in his front baldness.

in the back baldness or in the front baldness - Which is "karachath" and which is "gabachath"? From the top of the head sloping towards the back is "karachath"; from the top of the head sloping forwards is "gabachath" (Ibid.). 166,167

in the back baldness and in the front baldness - This teaches us that the back and the front do not combine with each other and that there is no spreading from one to the other [see commentary on (29)] (*Ibid.*). 168

it is blossoming leprosy - "leprosy" — this teaches us that it becomes unclean with an eruption of healthy flesh; "blossoming" — this teaches us that it becomes unclean with spreading; "it" — it does not become unclean with the issuing of white hair (*Ibid.*). 169-171

in his back baldness or in his front baldness - Just as back bladness is [generally] "Heaven-caused," so the front bladness [in this context is [the type that is] "heaven-caused." If so [we would say] just as back baldness [is of the type that generally] does not produce new hair, so front baldness [must be of the type that] does not produce new hair. Whence is it derived that if he ate or smeared his head with neshem [a depilatory, in which instance new hair will be produced — whence is it derived that such an instance is also included within this context?] From: "baldness" - "baldness," connoting extension of inclusion (Ibid.). 172-174

13:43 And the priest shall see him, and, behold, if a rising of the plague-spot, white-reddish, is in his back baldness or in his front baldness, as the appearance of the leprosy of the skin of the flesh.

as the appearance of the leprosy - as the appearance of the leprosy [which requires a quarantine] of two weeks (*Ibid.*).¹⁷⁵

13:44 He is a leprous man. He is unclean. The priest shall declare him unclean; in his head in his plague-spot.

a leprous man - The Rabbis taught: "man" — this tells me only of a man. Whence is a woman derived [for inclusion in the same rule]? "And the leper in which the plague-spot is found" (45) implies both [men and women]. Why, then, is "man" written here? For what is stated afterwards — a leprous man goes with long hair and rent clothes, but not a leprous woman (Sotah 23b). 176,177

13:45 And the leper in which the plague-spot is found, his clothes shall be rent and his hair shall grow long, and his upper lip shall be covered, and "Unclean! Unclean!" he shall cry.

And the leper - to include a high priest [who otherwise is enjoined from rending his clothes and allowing his hair to grow long] (Moed Katan 14b).¹⁷⁸

in which the plague-spot is found - There is no difference between a confirmed leper and a quarantined leper but the growing of the hair and the rending of the clothes alone [these applying only to the first but not to the second], as it is written: "And the leper in which the plague-spot is found" — one whose leprosy is contingent upon his bodily state [i.e., his unhealed plague-spot], as opposed to one whose leprosy is contingent upon days [i.e., the passage of the days of the quarantine] (Megillah 8b). 179,180

his clothes shall be rent - What is the law for tthe leper vis à vis the

tearing of his clothes? Come and hear: "his clothes shall be rent" — they shall be torn (*Moed Katan* 15a). 181

and his hair shall grow long - "periah" is nothing other than letting the hair grow long (*Ibid.*). 182

and his upper lip shall be covered - What is the law for the leper vis à vis the covering of the head? Come and hear: "and his upper lip shall be covered," implying that his head must be covered (*Ibid.*). 183

and his upper lip shall be covered - What is the law for the leper vis à vis the extending of greetings? Come and hear: "and his upper lip shall be covered" — his lips must be compressed, as one under a ban of excommunication, or as one in mourning, and the extending of greetings is forbidden (*Ibid.*). 184

and "Unclean!" Unclean!" he shall cry - This teches us that he must make his suffering manifest to the people so that they will pray on his behalf (*Ibid.* 5a). 185

and "Unclean! Unclean!" he shall cry - It was taught: Where is the marking of graves intimated in the Torah? R. Avahu answered: "and 'Unclean! Unclean!' he shall cry" — uncleanliness cries out, saying: "Keep away!" (*Ibid.*). 186

and "Unclean! Unclean!" he shall cry - Rava said to Rabbah b. Mari: Whence is derived the folk-saying: "Poverty follows the poor"? From: and 'Unclean! Unclean!' he shall cry" [Uncleanliness follows the unclean] (Bava Kamma 92a). 187

13:46 All the days that the plague-spot is in him he shall be unclean. He is unclean. Solitary shall he sit. Outside the camp is his dwelling.

All the days " - "all the days" — to include a quarantined leper in "sending" [outside the camp] (Megillah 8b). 188

All the days etc. - the days that the plague-spot is in him he shall be unclean — not the days that there was a bright spot in him, which he cut off. I might think that this is so even if he cut it off deliberately; it is,

therefore, written: "All the days" [to include the latter] (Torath Cohanim). 189,190

He is unclean. Solitary shall he sit. - This tells me only of this [type of leper] alone [as requiring "sending" outside the camp — only the "baldness" type]. Whence do I derive [the same rule for] the other leprous afflictions? From: "He is unclean. Solitary shall he sit" [implying that all who are unclean with leprosy are included in this restriction] (Ibid.). 191

Solitary shall he sit - Those with other types of uncleanliness shall not sit with him (*Pesachim* 67a). 192

Solitary shall he sit - It was taught: Why did the Torah single out the leper for: "Solitary shall he sit. Outside the camp is his dwelling"? He [by his slander, for which leprosy is the punishment] separated between a man and his wife, between a man and his neighbor; therefore, the Torah writes: "Solitary shall he sit" (Erchin 16b). 193

Outside the camp - outside the three camps (Torath Cohanim). 194

is his dwelling - From here it was ruled (*Negaim* 13:7): "If the unclean one sits under the tree, and the clean one stands under it, he becomes unclean; if the clean one sits under the tree and the unclean one stands under it, he [the clean one] remains clean (*Ibid.*). 195

13:47 And the garment, if there be in it a plague-spot of leprosy, in a garment of wool or in a garment of flax,

And the garment. This tells me only of a [complete] garment. Whence do I derive for inclusion [a piece of cloth the size of] three by three fingers? From: "And the garment" [implying extension of inclusion in the Hebrew] (Shabbath 26b). 196

And the garment - It was taught: R. Yossi b. Galili says: "Outside the camp is his dwelling. And the garment" — this [juxtaposition of verses] teaches us that garments require "sending" outside the three camps (Torath Cohanim). 197

in a garment of wool, etc. - R. Nachman b. Yitzchak said: The wool of a

nidmeh [a hybrid, a lamb born of a kid] is not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness, for it is written: "in a garment of wool or in a garment of flax" — just as flax does not change, [remaining what it was at its source] so wool [i.e., the wool referred to in this context, must be wool] that does not change [(but the wool of the nidmeh is a change from the wool of its source)] (Bechoroth 17a)^{198,199}

in a garment of wool, etc. - This tells me only of garments completely of wool or of flax. Whence do we derive for inclusion partial or total intermixtures [of wool and flax]? From: "And the garment" (Torath Cohanim), 200,201

or in a garment of flax - I might think that they are subject to uncleanliness whether dyed or not dyed; it is, therefore, written: "a garment of flax" — just as flax is in its original state [i.e., it is not the practice to dye flax], so [for plague-spot uncleanliness we require] wool in its original state (*Ibid.*).²⁰²

13:48 Or in the warp, or in the woof of flax and of wool; or in skin, or in any worked skin.

Or in the warp, etc. - I might think that they are subject to uncleanliness immediately [i.e., even before they are fully processed]; it is, therefore, written: "garment" — just as "garment" connotes complete processing, so all [i.e., warp, woof] must be completely processed (*Ibid.*).²⁰³

Or in the warp, etc. - I might think that any size is subject to uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "garment" — just as [something is not called a] "garment" until there is a weaving of warp and woof the size of three by three fingers, so, all [pieces of cloth, to be subject to uncleanliness, require that size] (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁴

or in skin - "skin" - "or in skin" [i.e., there is a redundancy here] — to include the skin of an unclean beast, and skin that was "afflicted" [with a plague-spot] while under examination by the priest (Shabbath 28a).²⁰⁵

worked skin - If he cut pieces of all of them [i.e., of all the varieties herein mentioned] and made one piece of them [amounting to the

required size for uncleanliness], whence do I derive [that that piece is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness]? From: "or in any worked skin" (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁶

worked skin - to exclude untanned hide and border hide, which have not been worked (*Torath Cohanim*). 207

13:49 And it shall be if the plague-spot is deep green or deep red in the garment or in the skin, or in the warp or in the woof, or in any article of skin, it is a plague-spot of leprosy, and it shall be shown to the priest.

deep green or deep red - This teaches us that a blending [of these colors] is not subject to uncleanliness. I might think that they [i.e., one section of deep green and another of deep red] do not combine with each other [to form the minimum required size]; it is, therefore, written: "And it shall be" (*Ibid.*). 208, 209

deep green or deep red - I might think it could be any shade of green or red; it is, therefore, written: "deep green or deep red" — the greenest of the green and the reddest of the red (*Ibid.*).²¹⁰

in the garment - "in the garment" — and not in the hairs [i.e., the nap] (*Ibid.*).²¹¹

or in the skin - to exclude the skins of shoe-laces, which are not [considered discrete] articles (*Ibid.*).²¹²

a plague-spot of leprosy - I might think that it must be a garment appropriate to both a rich man and a poor man. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the rule]: one that is appropriate to a rich man, but not to a poor man; to a poor man, but not to a rich man; to neither a rich man nor a poor man? From: "it is a plague-spot of leprosy, and it shall be shown to the priest" [in any event] (*Ibid.*).²¹³

a plague-spot of leprosy - "leprosy" — the size of a garis [a Cilician bean] (Ibid.).²¹⁴

- 13:50 And the priest shall see the plague-spot, and he shall quarantine the plague-spot for seven days.
- 13:51 And he shall see the plague-spot on the seventh day. If the plague-spot has spread in the garment, or in the warp or in the woof or in the skin, for all work which will be done with skin, the plague-spot is blight-leprosy; it is unclean.

If the plague-spot has spread - "has spread" — this refers to a spreading adjacent to the plague-spot, any amount [of spreading, in this, instance, producing uncleanliness]. Whence do I derive [as producing uncleanliness, a spreading which is] distant [from the plague-spot]? From: "in the garment" [i.e., anywhere in the garment]. I might think that any amount [of such a "distant" spreading would produce uncleanliness]; I, therefore, deduce: It is written here: "plague-spot," and, in respect to a plague-spot in the flesh: "plague-spot." Just as the plague-spot in the flesh must be a garis, so the plague-spot here must be a garis (Ibid.). 215-217

for all work which will be done with skin - to include tent-skins (*Ibid.*).²¹⁸

blight-leprosy - Invest it with a "blight," and derive no benefit from it. I would think that this applied only to [a garment with] a confirmed plague-spot. Whence do I derive [the same rule for a garment with] a quarantined plague-spot? From (52): "for it is blight-leprosy" [the repetition implying extension of inclusion]. If so, then just as with a confirmed garment, if one [cut it into pieces smaller than the minimum size for uncleanliness and] made sponge-balls of them, they remain unclean and no benefit may be derived from them, so [the same rule should apply to] a quarantined garment; it is, therefore, written: "for it is blight-leprosy" [connoting limitation of the extension] (*Ibid.*). ^{219,220}

13:52 And he shall burn the garment, or the warp or the woof, in the wool or in the flax or in any article of skin in which the plague-spot will be; for it is blight-leprosy — it shall be burned in fire.

And he shall burn the garment - It was taught: A piece of cloth [affected with a plague-spot] the size of three by three fingers, though it not contain [substance] the size of an olive, once most of it enters a clean house, it renders it unclean. Why so? For it is written: "And he shall burn the garment" — even at the time of burning it is still called a garment [and, thus, generates uncleanliness] (Yevamoth 103b). 221

in which the plague-spot will be - [i.e.,] which is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness (*Torath Cohanim*).²²²

it shall be burned in fire - Nothing else [i.e., no special kindling material] need be burned with it. Why, then, is it written: "in the wool or in the flax" [if not for the above intent]? To exclude [from the requirement of burning] appendages [to the garment which are not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness] (*Ibid.*).^{223,224}

13:53 And if the priest shall see, and, behold, the plague-spot has not spread in the garment, or in the warp or in the woof, or in any article of skin,

and, behold, the plague-spot has not spread - This refers to the stationariness [of the plague-spot itself, and not to the constancy of its color] (*Ibid.*).²²⁵

13:54 Then the priest shall command, and they shall wash what contains the plague-spot, and they shall quarantine it a second seven days.

The the priest shall command, and they shall wash - the commanding by the priest, and the washing, by any one (*Ibid.*). ²²⁶

they shall wash - with intent, and not by chance [i.e., by its falling into water] (Yerushalmi Shabbath 2:1). 227

they shall wash, etc. - I might think that they should wash the plague-spot [only]; it is, therefore, written: "what contains the plague-spot." If so, I might think that they must wash the entire garment; it is, therefore, written: "what contains the plague-spot." How is this to be reconciled? Some of the adjoining material is washed with it (Torath Cohanim).²²⁸

13:55 And the priest shall see, after the plague-spot has been washed, and, behold, the plague-spot has not changed its appearance, and the plague-spot has not spread — it is unclean. It shall be burned in fire; it is a fret in its frayed material or in its unworn material.

its appearance - [i.e., if it has not changed] from any variety of appearance which renders it unclean [though it may have changed from one unclean variety to another] (*Ibid.*).²²⁹

it is a fret - What is "a fret"? All of it appearing to be indented (Ibid.). 230

in its frayed material, etc. - It was taught: R. Natan b. Avtulmus says: Whence is it derived that the blossoming of the plague-spot throughout the entire garment renders it clean? "Karachath" and "gabachath" ["frayed material" and "unworn material"] are stated in respect to garments, and "karachath" and "gabachath" ["back-baldness" and "front-baldness"] are stated in respect to men [see (21)]. Just as there, complete blossoming renders him clean, here, too, complete blossoming renders the garment clean (Sanhedrin 88a). 231, 232

bekarachto o begabachto - "bekarachto" — these are the frayed parts; "begabachto" — these are the new [i.e., the unworn] parts (Torath Cohanim).²³³

13:56 And if the priest saw, and, behold, the plague-spot became dim after it was washed, then he shall tear it from the garment, or from the skin, or from the woof.

and, behold, the plague-spot became dim - after it was washed, then he shall tear it from the garment, or from the skin, or from the warp or from the woof.

and, behold, the plague-spot became dim - Second-degree dimness or third-degree dimness? [i.e., How many "dimnesses" must it undergo?] "the plague-spot" [above, indicates that second-degree dimness is intended, i.e., a dimming from "the plague-spot," and not from a dimming] (*Ibid.*).²³⁴

and, behold, the plague-spot became dim - "Plague-spot" is stated here, and, further on. Just as the plague-spot here is of second, and not third-degree dimness, so, that further on is of second, and not third-degree dimness (*Ibid.*).²³⁵

then he shall tear it - I might think that he tears it just a little to fulfill the *mitzvah* of tearing; it is, therefore, written: "it." If "it," I might think that he may tear it out and leave it in its place; it is, therefore, written: "from the garment" (*Ibid.*).²³⁶

13:57 And if it be seen again in the garment, or in the warp or in the woof, or in any article of skin, it is a blossoming; in fire shall you burn it, what contains the plague-spot.

And if it be seen again - "again" implies in its original place. This teaches us that he sews a piece of cloth upon it [i.e., in the space of the torn-out piece] (*Ibid.*).²³⁷

And if it be seen again - I might think, any amount; it is, therefore, written: "again"—just as the first was the size of a garis, the second, too, must be the size of a garis (Ibid.).²³⁸

it is a blossoming - whether or not in its original appearance [so long as its appearance is of the unclean type] (*Ibid.*).²³⁹

what contains the plague-spot - This teaches us that the torn-out pieces also require burning (*Ibid.*).²⁴⁰

13:58 And the garment, or the warp or the woof, or any article of skin which you shall wash; and the plague-spot depart from them, then it shall be washed a second time, and it shall be clean.

article of skin which you shall wash - Rava said: Now is there anyone who says that skin is not susceptible of washing? Is it not written: "any article of skin which you shall wash"? The idea is, rather, that any washing [of skin] where there is no rubbing [together of the sides] is not called washing (Zevachim 94a).²⁴¹

and the plague-spot depart from them - until it depart from them completely (Torath Cohanim).²⁴²

then it shall be washed a second time - It was taught: R. Yochanan b. Yosef says: The second washing is being likened to the first. Just as the first requires intent, so the second requires intent (Chullin 31b).^{243,244}

then it shall be washed a second time, and it shall be clean - the second, to render it clean; and the first, to quarantine the plague-spot (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁴⁵

13:59 This is the law of the plague-spot of leprosy, in a garment of wool or flax, or in the warp or in the woof, or in any kind of skin, to render it clean or to render it unclean.

This is the law, etc. - [And it is written (14:54-55): "This is the law ... for the leprosy of garment and of house"]. Garments are being likened to house, viz., just as a house is rendered unclean by the entry of an unclean person, so it is rendered unclean by the entry of all plague-spot garments]. If so, just as a house requires birds [see 14:49] for its cleansing, let all [plague-spot garments] require birds for their cleansing! To this end it is written: "This" [i.e., only in this respect (that of "entry") are they similar, and not in the other] (Ibid.). 246,247

to rendér it clean or to render it unclean - Plague-spots are not ruled upon on festivals, neither in the direction of leniency nor in that of stringency, as it is written: "to render it clean or to render it unclean" (Moed Katan 7b).²⁴⁸

to render it clean or to render it unclean - From here it is derived that just as it is a mitzvah to declare it clean, so it is a mitzvah to declare it unclean; and just as it is a mitzvah in the land [of Israel], so it is a mitzvah outside the land (Torath Cohanim).^{249,250}

to render it clean or to render it unclean - It was taught: The priest who declares it clean is the one who declared it unclean; and if he has died, a different priest rules upon it (*Ibid.*).²⁵¹

Metzora

- 14:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 14:2 This shall be the law of the leper on the day of his cleansing; he shall be brought to the priest.

This shall be - "shall be" — it must be exactly as prescribed [and if he deviated from the prescribed order, he must correct (the deviation accordingly if such correction is possible; otherwise, the offering is invalidated)] (Menachoth 5a).1

This shall be - The four species of the leper [cedar-wood, hyssop, scarlet, and birds] are mutually indispensable, for it is written: "This shall be the law of the leper" — as if it were written: "This is the statute" [connoting inadmissibility of deviation] (*Ibid.* 19a).²

This shall be the law - "This" — it does not relate to a bamah [a temporary altar]; "shall be" — in the present time [i.e., even after the destruction of the Temple]; "the law" — for the "eternal house" [i.e., the Temple] (Torath Cohanim).

the law of the leper - adult or minor (Nedarim 36a).4

the law of the leper - If he had a plague-spot which healed, and then, another plague-spot which healed, he brings only one offering, as it is written: "This shall be the law of the leper" — one law for many leprosies (Krituth 9b).5

the law of the leper - Resh Lakish said: That which is written: "This shall be the law of the leper [Heb., "MZORA"] — this shall be the law of the slanderer [Heb., "MoZi shem RA — slander being punishable by leprosy] (Erchin 15b).6

on the day of his cleansing - This teaches us that he must be declared clean or unclean during the day (Torath Cohanim).

on the day of his cleansing - All of the day is acceptable for the cleansing of the leper, as it is written: "on the day of his cleansing" (Megillah 21a).

on the day of his cleansing; he shall be brought - He shall not delay (Torath Cohanim).9

he shall be brought to the priest - This teaches us that [the entire cycle of] his uncleanliness and his cleansing must be overseen by a priest (*Ibid.*).¹⁰

14:3 And the priest shall go outside the camp, and the priest shall see, and, behold, if the plague-spot of leprosy is healed from the leper,

And the priest shall see - What is the intent of: "the priest"? A priest that may enter within the wall [i.e., one who is clean] may cleanse the leper, and one that may not enter may not cleanse; for one leper may not cleanse another (*Ibid.*). 11,12

and, behold, if the plague-spot of leprosy is healed - There is no difference between one cleansed after quarantine and one cleansed after confirmation [as a leper] except the *mitzvah* of shaving and that of the birds, [applying to the latter, but not to the former]; for it is written: "and, behold, if the plague-spot of leprosy is healed" — one whose leprosy does not hinge upon healing, but upon days [of quarantine] (Megillah 8b).¹³

and, behold, if the plague-spot of leprosy is healed - "the plague-spot is healed" — [this refers to] the departure of the white hair; "the plague-spot of leprosy" — [this refers to] the departure of the living flesh; "from the leper" — even part of the white hair, and even part of the living flesh (Torath Cohanim). 14,15

from the leper - to include one in whose entire body it has blossomed as requiring birds (*Ibid.*).¹⁶

14:4 And the priest shall command, and he shall take for the one to be cleansed two clean, living birds, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop.

And the priest shall command, and he shall take - the commanding, by the priest; the taking, by anyone (*Ibid.*). 17

and he shall take for the one to be cleansed - "for the one to be cleansed"
— in the name of one to be cleansed, whether man, woman, or child.
From here it was derived: If one took it for a man, it may be used for a woman; if for a woman, it may be used for a man; if for a house [afflicted with a plague-spot], it may be used for a leper; if for a leper, it may be used for a house (*Ibid.*). 18

two birds - The minimum of "birds" is two. If so, why state "two"? That they both be alike. Whence is it derived that even if they are not both alike, they are still valid? From: "bird" - "bird" [(5) and (6)] — implying extension of inclusion (Yoma 62b). 19,20

two birds - R. Yehoshua b. Levi said: Why was a leper singled out for the bringing of birds for his cleansing? He committed an act of prattling [i.e., slander]; the Torah, therefore, said: Let him bring a sacrifice of "prattlers" [i.e., "chirpers"] (*Erchin* 16b).^{21,22}

clean, living - "living" — to exclude *treifoth* [birds with organic defects which render them halachically "dead"]; "clean" — to exclude ritually unclean birds (*Chullin* 140a).²³

and cedar-wood - If "wood," I would think any wood; it is, therefore, written: "cedar." If "cedar," I would think an entire sapling; it is, therefore, written: "any wood." What is intended? A piece of wood cut from a cedar tree (Torath Cohanim).^{24,25}

and scarlet - [lit., "and scarlet of a worm"] — Just as "scarlet of a worm" [is scarlet from] a living creature, so anything [i.e., scarlet from anything] which is a living creature (Yerushalmi Kilaim 9:1).²⁶

and scarlet of a worm - If: "and scarlet," I would think rock-lichen were permissible; it is, therefore, written: "of a worm." If: "of a worm," I would think any one of its colors were permissible; it is, therefore, written: "and scarlet." What is intended? Deep crimson. Whence do I

derive that a blending is invalid? From: "and scarlet of a worm" [scarlet is insisted upon] (Torath Cohanim).²⁷⁻³⁰

and hyssop - "hyssop" — and not Greek hyssop, and not blue hyssop, and not Roman hyssop, and not desert hyssop, and not any "hyssop" qualified by an epithet (Negaim 14:6).³¹

14:5 And the priest shall command, and he shall slaughter the one bird into an earthen vessel over living water.

And the priest shall command, and he shall slaughter - It was taught: Rebbi says: The slaughtering, too, is performed by a priest (*Torath Cohanim*).³²

the one bird - "the one" — the more distinctive of the two; "the one" — if one of them dies or becomes a *treifah*, he takes a mate for the second one (*Ibid.*). ^{33,34}

the one bird into an earthen vessel - "the one into an earthen vessel," and not two [i.e., not two different birds of two different lepers] into one earthen vessel (*Ibid.*).³⁵

into an earthen vessel - a new earthenware bowl (Negaim 14a).³⁶

an earthen vessel, etc. - "into an earthen vessel over running water" — just as running water has had no work done in it, so a vessel [is required] that has had no work done in it (Sotah 15b).³⁷

living water - and not salted water, and not lukewarm water, and not failing water [i.e., whose source dries up], and not dripping water (*Torath Cohanim*). 38

14:6 The living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and he shall dip them and the living bird, in the blood of the slaughtered bird over the living water.

he shall take it - This teaches us that he keeps it separate from the others (*Ibid.*).³⁹

he shall take it - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if the blood were spilled, the bird for "sending" is to be put to death, or that if the bird for "sending" died, the blood is to be spilled? From: "The living bird, he shall take it" [and not another] (Ibid.).40

and the cedar-wood, etc. - What does he do? He takes the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and he binds them in tongues of wool, and he joins them with the wing-tips and tail-tip of the second bird, and he dips and sprinkles (Negaim 14:1).^{41,42}

and the living bird - What is the intent of this? The bird is "returned" for inclusion in diping [though it is not bound together with the others] (Torath Cohanim).⁴³

in the blood of the slaughtered bird - I might think in the blood and not in the water; it is, therefore, written: "in the water." If: "in the water," I might think in the water and not in the blood; it is, therefore, written: "in the blood." How is this effected? Water is brought, in which the blood of the bird is discernible. How much? A quarter [of a log] (Sotah 16b). 44,45

the slaughtered bird - the slaughtered one, and not the "pinched" one (Torath Cohanim).46

the slaughtered bird over the living water - "the blood of the slaughtered bird over the water" [i.e., the bird must be slaughtered over the water], and not the earthen vessel over the water (*Ibid.*).⁴⁷

14:7 And he shall sprinkle upon the one to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and he shall cleanse him; and he shall send the living bird over the face of the field.

And he shall sprinkle upon the one to be cleansed - on the upper surface of the leper's hand (*Ibid.*). 48

upon the one to be cleansed from the leprosy - the one to be cleansed from the leprosy requires seven sprinklings, but the one to be cleansed from dead-body uncleanliness does not require seven sprinklings (*Ibid.*).⁴⁹

seven times - He requires seven sprinklings, but he does not require

sprinkling on the third and seventh days [as does one with dead-body uncleanliness] (*Ibid.*).50

and he shall cleanse him - through those things that are done upon his body [viz., sprinkling, shaving, and bathing]. I might think that his cleansing is thus consummated; it is, therefore, written: "And he shall send," "And he shall shave," "And he shall wash," "And he shall bathe." I might think that they are all indispensable to his cleanliness; it is, therefore, written [here, after sprinkling]: "and he shall cleanse him," and [after sending, washing, shaving, and bathing] (8): "and he shall be clean." Just as the first cleansing relates to what is performed upon his body [i.e., the sprinkling], so the second relates to what is performed upon his body [i.e., the shaving and the bathing, and not the sending of the bird and the washing of his clothes] (Ibid.). 51,52

and he shall send - The Rabbis taught: The bird of "sending" may be eaten. Why so? For the Torah writes: "and he shall send"; and the Torah does not write: "he shall send" as a stumbling-block [for one who finds the bird and unwittingly eats it] (Kiddushin 57b).⁵³

and he shall send - If he sent it and it returned, he must send it again — even a hundred times (Tosefta Negaim 8). 53*

over the face of the field - How does he send it? He does not stand in Yaffo and fling it towards the sea; in Gabbath, and fling it towards the desert; outside the city, and fling it towards the desert; outside the city, and fling it towards the city; but he stands in the city and flings it outside the wall (*Ibid.*).⁵⁴

14:8 And the one to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and he shall shave all of his hair, and he shall bathe in water, and he shall be clean; and then he shall come into the camp. And he shall sit outside his tent for seven days.

And he shall shave all of his hair - How does he shave? [completely clean] as a cucumber (Sotah 16a).55

And he shall sit outside his tent - "his tent" is his wife, as it is written (Deuteronomy 5:27): "Go say to them: Return to your tents." From here

it is derived that marital relations are forbidden to a leper (Moed Katan 15b).⁵⁶

And he shall sit outside his tent - "his tent" is his wife, and the Torah states: "And he shall sit outside his tent" — and not [that she shall sit] outside her tent. This teaches us that marital relations are permitted to a woman leper (Krituth 8b).⁵⁷

14:9 And it shall be on the seventh day that he shall shave all of his hair. His head, his beard, and the brows of his eyes, and all of his hair shall he shave. And he shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall be clean.

on the seventh day - in the daytime, and not at night (Torath Cohanim). 58

His head - Now if it is written: "And he shall shave all of his hair," why need "his head" be stated? Since it is written (*Ibid.* 19:27): "Do not round the corners of your heads," I might think that a leper, too, is included in this interdiction; it is, therefore, written: "His head" (*Yevamoth* 5a).⁵⁹

His head, etc. - Why state this? Since it is stated in respect to a Nazirite (Numbers 6:5): "a razor shall not come upon his head," I might think that the same is true for a Nazirite who is a leper; it is, therefore, written: "His head." Why state: "his beard"? Since it is written in respect to priests (Ibid. 21:5): "And the corner of their beard they shall not shave," I might think that the same is true for a priest who is a leper; it is, therefore written: "his beard" (Nazir 41a).60

and the brows of his eyes - the brows of his eyes, and not the lids of his eyes (Torath Cohanim).⁶¹

and all of his hair shall he shave - Why state again: "shall he shave"? To stipulate responsibility for shaving; if he did not shave on the seventh day, he is required to do so on the eighth, the ninth, the tenth (*Ibid.*).62

14:10 And on the eighth day, he shall take two he-lambs without blemish, and one ewe-lamb of the first year, without

blemish, and three-tenths of an *ephah* of fine flour, a meal-offering mixed in oil, and one *log* of oil.

fine flour, a meal-offering - Is Scripture speaking of the meal-offering that accompanies the sacrifice, or of a meal-offering brought independently? "And the priest shall offer up the burnt-offering and the meal-offering" (20) indicates that Scripture is speaking of the meal-offering that accompanies the sacrifice (Menachoth 91a). 63,64

14:11 And the priest that cleanses shall stand the man who is to be cleansed and those things before the L-rd, at the door of the tent of meeting.

before the L-rd - They are placed at the gate of Nikanor, their backs to the east, and their faces to the west (*Torath Cohanim*).⁶⁵

14:12 And the priest shall take the one he-lamb and he shall offer it up as a guilt-offering with the *log* of oil, and he shall lift them, a lifting before the L-rd.

and he shall lift them - This teaches us that they require lifting as one. Whence is it derived that if he lifted each individually it is valid? From: "and he shall offer it up as a guilt-offering... and he shall lift." I might think that he should [first] lift [both] and then lift [each individually]; it is, therefore, written: "a lifting," and not "liftings" (Menachoth 61a).66

- a lifting before the L-rd There is no lifting on a bamah [a temporary altar], for it is written: "and he shall lift them a lifting before the L-rd" [a bamah not being considered "before the L-rd"] (Zevachim 119b).⁶⁷
- 14:13 And he shall slaughter the lamb in the place where the sinoffering is slaughtered, and the burnt-offering in the place of the sanctuary. For, as the sin-offering, so is the guiltoffering to the priest; it is holy of holies.

as the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering - It is likened to the sin-

offering. Just as the sin-offering requires a vessel [for the receiving of the blood], so the guilt-offering requires a vessel (Yoma 61b).⁶⁸

as the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering - It is likened to the sin-offering. Just as the sin-offering requires the bestowing of blood and devoted portions upon the altar, so the guilt-offering requires the bestowing of blood and devoted portions upon the altar (Zevachim 49a).⁶⁹

as the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering - It is likened to the sin-offering. Just as the sin-offering is consummated by the blood of the altar, so the guilt-offering is consummated by the blood of the altar (Torath Cohanim).⁷⁰

it is holy of holies - "holy of holies" — to include the *log* of oil of the leper; "it" — to exclude [(from validity) oil] which is lacking the least amount [from the *log*] (*Ibid.*).⁷¹

14:14 And the priest shall take from the blood of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall place it on the *tnuch* of the right ear of the one to be cleansed, and on the thumb of his right hand, and on the big toe of his right foot.

And the priest shall take - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall take"; I might think in a vessel. It is, therefore, written: "and he shall place"—just as the placing is by the priest himself [without a vessel], so the taking is by the priest himself (Yoma 61b)."

on the tnuch - I might think that the very inside ["toch"] were meant; it is, therefore, written: "nuch" [the "n" within the word "tnuch" diminishing the "insideness" of "toch"]. If so, I might think that the upper tip of the ear were intended; it is, therefore, written [in effect]: "toch nuch" ["the inside of the nuch"]. How is this effected? He places it on the middle partition [beneath the tip, i.e., the anti-helix] (Torath Cohanim). "3-75

and on the thumb of his right hand, etc. - If he has no right thumb, or great toe, or ear, he can never be cleansed (Negaim 14:9).⁷⁶

14:15 And the priest shall take from the *log* of oil, and he shall pour onto the priest's left palm.

from the log of oil, and he shall pour - If the log [the vessel] lacks the necessary amount: before he has poured, he may refill it; after he has poured, he must bring another to begin with (*Ibid.* 10).⁷⁷

on the priest's left palm - It is a *mitzvah* [for one priest] to pour into another priest's palm; but if he poured into his own palm, it is valid (*Ibid.*).⁷⁸

14:16 And the priest shall dip his right finger from the oil on his left palm, and he shall sprinkle from the oil with his finger seven times before the L-rd.

And the priest shall dip his right finger - Rabbah b. B. Chanah said in the name of R. Shimon b. Levi: Wherever "finger" or priesthood are mentioned, the right finger is intended. Whence is this derived? From the instance of the leper, where it is written: "And the priest shall dip his right finger" (Menachoth 10a).⁷⁹

before the L-rd - This teaches us that he dips and sprinkles seven times in the direction of the holy of holies, dipping for each sprinkling (*Torath Cohanim*). 80

14:17 And from the rest of the oil which is in his palm, the priest shall place on the *tnuch* of the right ear of the one to be cleansed, and on the thumb of his right hand, and on the big toe of his right foot, upon the blood of the guilt-offering.

and on the thumb of his right hand, etc. - R. Yirmiah asked R. Zeira: Why is it necessary to state [again]: "on the thumb of his right hand, and on the big toe of his right foot"? He answered: One, to validate the sides; and the other, to invalidate the sides of the sides [i.e., the flesh adjoining the under surface] (Menachoth 9b). 81,82

upon the blood of the guilt-offering - [Is the meaning] that the blood

precede the oil, or that if blood is there, he shall place the oil, and if blood is not there, he shall not place the oil? "upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering" (28) indicates that it is not the blood which is the decisive factor, but the place (Torath Cohanim).83

14:18 And what is left over of the oil which is on the palm of the priest, he shall place on the head of the one who is to be cleansed, and the priest shall atone for him before the L-rd.

And what is left over of the oil, etc. - If the "placings" of the priest were completed, and the log spilled out, all agree that the [omission of] "placing" on the head does not invalidate the cleansing. Why so? For it is written (17): "And from the rest of the oil... And what is left over of the oil... he shall place on the head of the one who is to be cleansed" [the implication being that he must do so only if something is left over] (Yoma 61a).84

14:19 And the priest shall offer up the sin-offering, and he shall atone for the one to be cleansed from his uncleanliness, and then he shall slaughter the burnt-offering.

And the priest shall offer up the sin-offering - All of the prescribed activities must be with express intention for a sin-offering (Zevachim 4a).85

the sin-offering, and he shall atone - This teaches us that the basis of the atonement is the sin-offering (Torath Cohanim). 86

and he shall atone for the one to be cleansed - for this one to be cleansed, and not for his neighbor [i.e., one man's sin-offering cannot be used for another] (Zevachim 8a).87

from his uncleanliness - from his [leprosy] uncleanliness, and not from his zav [genital discharge] uncleanliness (Torath Cohanim).88

14:20 And the priest shall offer up the burnt-offering and the

oblation upon the altar, and the priest shall atone for him, and he shall be clean.

And the priest shall offer up - [What is the novelty here?] Even though he did not slaughter it for its express purpose [it is still valid] (*Ibid.*).89

And the priest shall offer up the burnt-offering - the burnt-offering that he had already offered up [so, the connotation in the Hebrew] [This teaches us that if he offered up the burnt-offering before the sin-offering (contrary to the conventional order) it is still valid] (*Pesachim* 59b). 90

14:21 And if he is poor, and he cannot attain, then he shall take one he-lamb as a guilt-offering, as a lifting, to atone for him, and one *issaron* of fine flour mixed with oil as a meal-offering, and a *log* of oil.

And if he is poor - If one said: "I vow to bring the offering of this leper," if the leper were poor and the vower, rich, he brings the offering of a rich man. Why so? For it is written: "And if he is poor"; but in this case, he is not poor! (*Erchin* 17a).⁹¹

And if he is poor - If one said: "I vow to bring the offering of this leper," if the leper were rich and the vower, poor, he brings the offering of a rich man. Why so? For it is written: "And if he is poor" (*Ibid.* b). 92

and he cannot attain - If one said: "I vow to bring the offering of this leper," if the leper were poor and the vower, poor, he brings the offering of a poor man. Why so? For it is written: "and he cannot attain" — to include the vower (*Ibid.* a).⁹³

and he cannot attain - I might think that if he became poorer than he was [when he incurred responsibility for the offering], such as one who possessed one hundred manah who was reduced to fifty manah — I might think that such a one could be called "poor" [and not be liable for a rich man's offering]; it is, therefore, written: "and he cannot attain" — but this one can attain! (Torath Cohanim).94

and he cannot attain - I might think that this applies even if he has the means, but does not readily find the object; it is, therefore, written:

"And if he is poor" [i.e., only then is he exempt from a rich man's offering] (*Ibid.*).95

one he-lamb - R. Akiva asked R. Nechemiah: What is the intent of "one"? He answered: This one [the leper] brings according to his means, and one who atones for sanctuary uncleanliness brings according to his means. I might think that just as in the latter instance the poor man brings two [birds] in place of the rich man's one [lamb], here, too, he brings two in place of one; it is, therefore, written: "one" (*Ibid*.). 96,97

as a lifting, to atone - Now is it "lifting" that atones? Is it not the blood that atones? [The meaning is] that if he regards the lifting as merely incidental to the *mitzvah*, it is as if he does, and yet, does not atone (Yoma 5a).98

and one issaron of fine flour - This teaches us that each issaron [of a meal-offering that one brings] requires a [distinct] log of oil (Menachoth 89a).⁹⁹

as a meal-offering, and a log of oil - The donor of a meal-offering must not bring less than that which requires a log [of oil for mixing]. And how much is that? An issaron (Ibid.).¹⁰⁰

and a log of oil - What is the intent of this? [i.e., What is there about this that is distinct for the poor man?] I might think that he should bring a *third* of a log [consistent with the foregoing proportion to the rich man's offering]; it is, therefore, written: "and a *log* of oil" (*Torath Cohanim*). 101

- 14:22 And two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, which he can attain; and one shall be a sin-offering, and the other, a burnt-offering.
- 14:23 And he shall bring them on the eighth day of his cleansing to the priest, to the door of the tent of meeting, to the priest, before the L-rd.

- 14:24 And the priest shall take the lamb of the guilt-offering, and the *log* of oil, and the priest shall lift them, a lifting before the L-rd.
- 14:25 And he shall slaughter the lamb of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall take from the blood of the guilt-offering and place it on the *tnuch* of the right ear of the one to be cleansed, and on the thumb of his right hand, and on the big toe of his right foot.
- 14:26 And of the oil, the priest shall pour onto the priest's left palm.
- 14:27 And the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger of the oil that is upon his left palm, seven times before the L-rd.
- 14:28 And the priest shall place from the oil that is on his palm upon the *tnuch* of the right ear of the one to be cleansed, and on the thumb of his right hand, and on the big toe of his right foot, upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering.

upon the place, etc. - "upon the blood of the guilt-offering" (17), and, [here] "upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering" — why are both [phrasings] needed? They are needed. For if it were written only: "upon the blood of the guilt-offering," I would think that if the blood were still there, it is valid, but if it were wiped away, it is not valid; it is, therefore, written: "upon the place." And if it were written only: "upon the place," I would think that it is valid only if the blood were wiped away, but if it were still there, it would be regarded as a barrier [against the oil and render the cleansing invalid]; it is, therefore, written: "upon the blood of the guilt-offering" (Menachoth 10a). 102-104

14:29 And what is left over of the oil which is on the palm of the priest, he shall place on the head of the one who is to be cleansed, to atone for him before the L-rd.

he shall...to atone - This teaches us that if it is placed, there is atonement, but if it is not placed, there is no atonement (Zevachim 6b).¹⁰⁵

- 14:30 And he shall offer one of the turtle-doves or one of the young pigeons from what he is able to attain.
- 14:31 From what he is able to attain, one for a sin-offering; the other, for a burnt-offering, with the meal-offering.
- 14:32 This is the law for him with a plague-spot of leprosy, who is unable to attain in his cleansing.

This is the law - "The law" — to include the validity of an offering prescribed for a rich leper brought by a poor leper. I might think that if a rich leper brought the offering prescribed for a poor leper it is also valid; it is, therefore, written: "This" [and not the latter] (Krituth 28a). 106

in his cleansing - If a [poor] leper brought his guilt-offering and then became rich [or vice versa], R. Yehudah says: Everything follows [his status at the time of] the guilt-offering; for it is written: "who is unable to attain [i.e., who is without means] in his cleansing"—the thing that cleanses him [i.e., the guilt-offering, is the criterion for the establishment of his status] (*Ibid.* 9b). 107

- 14:33 And the L-rd spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying;
- 14:34 When you come to the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put a plague-spot of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession,

When you come to the land - I might think [that this applies] when they come to trans-Jordan; it is, therefore, written: "to the land" — to the specific land [of Israel] (Torath Cohanim). 108

which I give to you - I might think [that this applies] when they come to Ammon and Moav; it is, therefore, written: "which I give to you," and not Ammon and Moav (*Ibid.*). 109

for a possession - [not] until they conquer it. If they conquered it and did not yet divide it among the tribes; if they divided it among the tribes, but did not yet apportion it into patrimonies; if they apportioned it into patrimonies, but each did not clearly recognize his own — in this connection it is stated (35): "Then he whose house it is shall come" — one to whom it distinctly belongs; to exclude instances of non-determinate possession (Yoma 14a). 110

and I put a plague-spot of leprosy - It was taught: R. Yehudah says: This is an intimation that plague-spots will, indeed, come upon them (Horiyoth 10a).¹¹¹

in a house - It was taught: A house which is not four by four ells in size is not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness. Why so? For: "a house" is written in that connection [and if it is not that size, it is not considered a house] (Succah 3b). 112

in a house of the land - to exclude a house built upon a boat or on a four-beamed raft, and to include one built in a tree or on pillars [fixed in the ground, in which instance the house is considered in "the land"] (Torath Cohanim). 113,114

in a house of the land of your possession - It was taught: A synagogue, a jointly owned house, and the house of one's wife [which she received as a bridal portion] are subject to plague-spot uncleanliness, for it is written: "in a house of the land of your possession" (Yoma 11b).¹¹⁵

in a house of the land of your possession - All houses are subject to plague-spot uncleanliness except those of gentiles, as it is written: "in a house of the land of your possession" — a house of the land of your possession is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness, but the houses of gentiles are not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness (Gittin 82a). 116

the land of your possession - It was taught: Jerusalem is not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness. Why so? For it is written: "in a house of the land of your possession," and Jerusalem was not divided among the tribes (Bava Kamma 82b).¹¹⁷

the land of your possession - the land of your possession is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness, but not other lands (Negaim 12:4).¹¹⁸

14:35 Then he whose house it is shall come, and he shall tell the priest, saying: As a plague-spot there has appeared to me in the house.

Then he whose house it is shall come - "Then he shall come" — he; he cannot send a messenger. I might think that this is so even if he is old or sick; it is, therefore, written: "Then he shall come" (Torath Cohanim). 119

whose house it is - It was taught: I might think that synagogues and houses of study [where there are no living quarters] are subject to plague-spot uncleanliness; it is, therefore, written: "whose house it is" — one to whom it distinctly belongs, to exclude the above, which are not distinctly his (Yoma 12a). 120

whose house it is - It was taught: Plague-spots come because of niggardliness, as it is written: "Then he whose house it is shall come," concerning which it was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: This refers to one who arrogates his house to himself [Not desiring to lend his utensils to others, he denies possessing them, and the Holy One Blessed be He exposes him when he is constrained to empty out his house] (Erchin 16a). 121

and he shall tell the priest, saying - "and he shall tell" — this teaches us that the priest shall make a close inquiry as to how the plague-spot came to his house: "saying" — the priest shall tell him of recondite matters: "My son, plague-spots come only because of slander" (Torath Cohanim). 122, 123

As a plague-spot - ["As a plague-spot," and not: "A plague-spot"] Though he be a Torah scholar and know for a certainty that it is a

plague-spot, he shall not declare outright: "It is a plague-spot," but: "As a plague-spot..." (Negaim 12:5).124

As a plague-spot there has appeared to me - "to me," and not "to my light" — this teaches us that plague-spots are not ruled upon at night [by candle light] (Moed Katan 8a). 125

in the house - to include the balcony, and to include the attic (*Nedarim* 56a). 126

in the house - It causes uncleanliness from its *inside*, and not from its outside (*Torath Cohanim*). 127

14:36 And the priest shall command, and they shall empty out the house before the priest comes in to see the plague-spot, so that there not be made unclean all that is in the house; and then the priest shall come to see the house.

And the priest shall command, and they shall empty - the commanding by the priest, and the emptying, by anyone (*Ibid.*). 128

and they shall empty out the house - It was taught: Plague-spots come because of theft, as it is written: "And the priest shall command, and they shall empty out the house," concerning which it was taught: He took in property that was not his — the priest shall come and scatter his property (Erchin 16a).¹²⁹

so that there not be made unclean, etc. - R. Meir said: Now what can become unclean? If you say his wooden utensils, his clothing, and his metal utensils, can he not immerse them and cleanse them? What was the Torah solicitous of? His earthenware vessels and his jars [which cannot be cleansed by immersion]! (Negaim 12:5). [130,131]

14:37 And he shall see the plague-spot, and, behold, if the plague-spot is in the walls of the house, embedded, deep green or deep red, and their appearance is lower than the wall,

and, behold, if the plague-spot - This [the repetition of "plague-spot"]

teaches us that the minimum size for house plague-spot uncleanliness is two garisin [Cilician beans] (Torath Cohanim). 132

in the walls of the house - The Rabbis taught: A circular, two-walled, three-walled, or five-walled house is not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness; a four-walled house is subject to plague-spot uncleanliness. Why so? For it is written [here]: "walls" [implying two], and, further on (39): "walls," giving us four (Nazir 8b). 133-135

sheka'aruroth - What is meant by "sheka'aruroth"? Embedded in their appearance [i.e., remaining beneath the surface after the surface is peeled off] (Torath Cohanim). 136

14:38 Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house, and he shall shut up the house for seven days.

Then the priest shall go out, etc. - Whence is derived this principle of the sages: "Things are regarded as retaining their status"? R. Shmuel b. Nachmani said in the name of R. Yonathan: From: "Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house, and he shall shut up the house, etc." Now may it not be that by the time he goes out the plague-spot will have contracted beneath the minimum size for uncleanliness? It must be, then, that the plague-spot is regarded as retaining its [last perceived] status (Chullin 10b).¹³⁷

Then the priest shall go out, etc. - He does not go into his own house and shut it up, and he does not stand in the house containing the plague-spot and shut it up, but he stands [directly] outside the door of the house containing the plague-spot and shuts it up, as it is written: "Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house and he shall shut up the house" (Negaim 12:6). 138,139

14:39 And the priest shall return on the seventh day and he shall see; if the plague-spot is spread in the walls of the house,

in the walls of the house - and not in the walls of its annex, and not in the walls of the stable, and not in the walls of the mechitzah and not in

the walls of the *menorah* [also types of structures around the house] (Torath Cohanim). 140

14:40 Then the priest shall command, and they shall remove the stones containing the plague-spot, and they shall cast them outside the city onto an unclean place.

Then the priest shall command, and they shall remove - the commanding, by the priest; the removing, by anyone (*Ibid.*).¹⁴¹

and they shall remove - This teaches us that both of them [i.e., the owner of the affected house and his neighbor (who shares the wall)] remove, both of them scrape, both of them bring [new] stone — whence it is derived: "Woe to the wicked one and woe to his neighbor!" I might think that if the wall adjoined the air [of his neighbor's property, but was not common to both of their houses] both of them should do the removal; it is, therefore, written (43): "after he had removed the stones" [the reference being to the afore-mentioned instance] (Ibid.). 142-145

and they shall remove the stones - I might think that he can remove two stones and thereby fulfill the *mitzvah* of "removing"; it is, therefore, written: "containing the plague-spot." If: "containing the plague-spot," I might think [that it suffices to remove] even mattocks and even bricks; it is, therefore, written: "stones" (*Ibid.*). 146

and they shall cast them - "them outside the city," but the man [casting them] must not be outside the city. [The implication is that they must be cast] outside such cities as are surrounded by walls (*Ibid.*). 147

onto an unclean place - It must be designated as an unclean place (Ibid.). 148

14:41 And the house he shall scrape from inside roundabout, and they shall spill the mortar which they have scraped off outside the city onto an unclean place.

he shall scrape from inside roundabout - I might think from inside and from outside; it is, therefore, written: "from inside." If: "from inside,"

I might think from the ground and from the walls; it is, therefore, written: "roundabout" — only the area roundabout the plague-spot (*Ibid.*).¹⁴⁹

the mortar, etc. - If: "which they have scraped off," I might think that pebbles [are included]; it is, therefore, written: "mortar." If: "mortar," I might think that even what fell of itself [is included]; it is, therefore, written: "which they have scraped off" (*Ibid.*). 150

14:42 And they shall take other stones, and they shall bring them in place of the stones; and he shall take other mortar and he shall plaster the house.

And they shall take other stones - no fewer than two stones (Ibid.). 151

other stones - If: "stones," I would think that he could take stones from one side and bring them to the other side; it is, therefore, written: "other" (*Ibid.*). 152

and other mortar - to include even bricks, even ordure, even clay-ground. I might think even lime, even gypsum; it is, therefore, written: "mortar" [lit., "earth"] (*Ibid.*). 153,154

and he shall plaster - This teaches us that his neighbor does not share the plastering with him (*Ibid.*). 155

- 14:43 And if the plague-spot returns, and blossoms in the house after the stones have been removed, and after the house has been scraped, and after it has been plastered,
- 14:44 Then the priest shall come and he shall see; and, behold, if the plague-spot is spread in the house, it is a blight of leprosy in the house it is unclean.

Then the priest shall come - It was taught (39): "And the priest shall return" [and here]: "And the priest shall come." Coming is being likened to returning. Just as returning is at the end of a week, so coming

is at the end of a week; and just as with returning, there is removing, scraping, plastering, and a one-week hiatus, so with coming, there is removing, scraping, plastering, and a one-week hiatus (*Ibid.*).¹⁵⁶

14:45 Then he shall break down the house — its stones, its wood, and all the mortar of the house; and he shall take them outside the city to an unclean place.

its stones, etc. - "Then he shall break down the house — its stones, its wood, and all the mortar of the house." This teaches us that a house is not subject to plague-spot uncleanliness unless there be in it stones, wood, and mortar (*Ibid.*). 157

its stones, etc. - "Then he shall break down the house — its stones, its wood, and all the mortar of the house." The stones of the house, and not the stones of the attic; the wood of the house, and not the wood of the attic; the mortar of the house, and not the mortar of the attic (Ibid.). 158

14:46 And he who comes into the house all the days that he has shut it up shall be unclean until the evening.

And he who comes into the house - R. Oshiya said: One who walks into an afflicted house backwards — even all of him, with the exception of his nose — is clean, for it is written: "And he who comes into the house" — it is only by way of "coming" that the Torah forbade it. But if he entered [backwards] entirely, it is no different from [the situation of] the vessels in the house, concerning which it is written (36): "so that there not be made unclean all that is in the house" (Shevuoth 17b). 159

And he who comes into the house - when he enters — his head and the greater part of his body (*Torath Cohanim*). 160

all the days that he has shut it up - the days that he has shut it up, and not the days after which he had scraped its plague-spot. I might think that the same is true of a confirmed plague-spot house [(one that requires breaking down)] whose plague-spot was scraped; it is, therefore, written: "all the days" [in reference to such a contingency] (*Ibid.*). 161,162

shall be unclean until the evening - This teaches us that he is not required to wash his clothes (*Ibid.*). 163

14:47 And he who lies in the house shall wash his clothes, and he who eats in the house shall wash his clothes.

And he who lies, etc. - This tells me only of lying and eating. Whence do I derive the same for an instance of his not lying down or eating [but simply remaining there for a comparable amount of time]? From [the repetition of]: "shall wash his clothes" [the repetition indicating extension of inclusion]. If so, why state "lies" and "eats"? To establish the [minimum] time for lying as corresponding to that of eating. And what is that of eating? As long as it takes to eat a pras [half a loaf of bread] (Ibid.). 164

shall wash his clothes - All "washing of clothes" in the Torah connotes stringency, whereas this connotes leniency; for even if he were wearing ten garments, they are all clean unless he remained there for the amount of time it takes to eat a pras (*Ibid.*).¹⁶⁵

shall wash his clothes - ["eth begadav," lit., "with his clothes"] — to include one who himself becomes unclean as "saving" his clothes [by washing them after they have become unclean] in a house with a plague-spot, and to exclude beasts and idol-worshippers, who, not becoming unclean themselves, do not save their clothes from uncleanliness (Ibid.). 166

- 14:48 And if the priest shall come and see, and, behold, the plague-spot has not spread in the house after the house has been plastered, then the priest shall declare the house clean, for the plague-spot has been healed.
- 14:49 And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop.

- 14:50 And he shall slaughter the one bird into an earthen vessel over living water.
- 14:51 And he shall take the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and he shall dip them in the blood of the slaughtered bird and in the living water, and he shall sprinkle upon the house seven times.
- 14:52 And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird and with the living water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar-wood, and with the hyssop, and with the scarlet.
- 14:53 And he shall send the living bird outside the city over the face of the field, and he shall atone for the house, and it shall be clean.

And he shall send the living bird, etc. - It was taught: R. Yossi Haglili says: "And he shall send the living bird outside the city" — a bird that lives outside the city. Which is that? A free bird [i.e., one which lives anywhere] (*Ibid.*). 167

14:54 This is the law for all plague-spots of leprosy and for a blanched spot.

This is the law, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that a priest who is an expert on plague-spots, but not on blanched spots or on baldness; on the plague-spots of men, but not on those of garments; on the plague-spots of garments, but not on those of houses — whence is it derived that he should not rule upon plague-spots? From: "This is the law for all plague-spots of leprosy and for a blanched spot, and for the leprosy of clothing and of a house" (*Ibid.*). 168

14:55 And for the leprosy of clothing and of a house.

14:56 And for the rising, or the like, or for the bright spot.

And for the rising or the like - R. Ashi said: All men of vain spirit are, in the end, humbled, as it is written: "laset" [homiletically: "rising in pride"] "velasapachat" [homiletically: "being brought low"] (Sotah 5a). 169

14:57 To teach concerning the day of uncleanliness and concerning the day of cleanliness. This is the law of leprosy.

To teach - This teaches us that the priest does not rule on plague-spots until he has been taught by his master (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁷⁰

- 15:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying:
- 15:2 Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: A man, a man, if there be a discharge from his flesh, his discharge is unclean.

Speak to the children of Israel - The children of Israel are subject to discharge uncleanliness, but not gentiles (Niddah 34a).

and say to them - to include converts and servants (Torath Cohanim).2

a man, a man - What is the intent of: "a man, a man"? To include a one-day-old infant as subject to discharge uncleanliness (Niddah 44a).³

if there be a discharge from his flesh - from [the nature of] his flesh, and not through some external cause [such as illness, jumping, carrying a burden, and the like] (Krituth 8b).4

if there be a discharge from his flesh - a zav [a man with a discharge] does not become unclean until his uncleanliness issues forth outside, as it is written: "if there be a discharge from his flesh" — his discharge must come out of his flesh (Niddah 43a).

his discharge is unclean - This teaches us that the discharge itself [and not only the zav] is unclean (*Ibid.* 55a).6

is unclean - It [the zav discharge (see 11 below)] is unclean, but blood that comes from his mouth or from his penis is not unclean, but clean (Ibid. 67a).⁷

15:3 And this shall be his uncleanliness in his discharge: if his flesh drip with his discharge, or if his flesh be closed up from his discharge, it is his uncleanliness.

And this shall be his uncleanliness - to include urine [i.e., the urine of the zav, which contains particles of his discharge] as subject to discharge uncleanliness (*Ibid.* 55b).⁸

And this shall be - "shall be" — any amount (Torath Cohanim).9

his uncleanliness in his discharge - Scripture made the uncleanliness of the zav [the male] contingent upon sightings [of discharge], and the uncleanliness of the zavah [the female] contingent upon days [of sighting] (Bava Kamma 24a).¹⁰

his uncleanliness in his discharge - He becomes unclean with white [i.e., a whitish discharge], but not with red [i.e., blood — as opposed to the case with a zavah] (Torath Cohanim).¹¹

in his flesh drip - "his discharge" — one; "his flesh drip" — two; "his discharge" — three; this teaches us that a zav who sees three times must bring an offering (Niddah 43b).¹²

or if his flesh be closed up - From here we derive that a moist condition produces uncleanliness, but not a dry one (*Ibid.*).¹³

from his discharge - This ["from," but not "all of"] teaches us that a zav of two sightings is subject to "lying" and "sitting" uncleanliness (*Ibid.*). 14

it is his uncleanliness - From here ["his uncleanliness"] it is derived that the uncleanliness of the man is produced by a whitish discharge, and that of the woman by a reddish one [i.e., blood] (Torath Cohanim).¹⁵

15:4 Everything made for lying on which the zav lies down shall be unclean, and every object that he sits upon shall be unclean.

Everything made for lying - That which is specifically designated for lying down upon (*Ibid.*).¹⁶

Everything made for lying - This teaches us that an object for reclining becomes unclean beneath a zav, and, in turn, renders men and garments [which come in contact with it] unclean; but a man does not become unclean beneath a zav [who rests upon him] to render men and garments unclean (*Ibid.*).¹⁷

on which the zav lies down - so that most of his bulk is supported by it (*Ibid.*). 18

the zav - Only "the zav" generates "lying" and "sitting" uncleanliness, and not one with a seminal discharge, and not a stone with a plague-spot, and not one with dead-body uncleanliness, and not a dead body (*Ibid.*).¹⁹

that he sits upon - I might think that if he inverted a sa'ah or a tarkav [measuring instruments] and sat upon them, they would become unclean; it is, therefore, written: "that he sits upon" — what is specifically made for sitting, to exclude that of which people say: "Get up, so that we can do our work!" (Shabbath 59a).²⁰

shall be unclean - to include his reclining on an object made for sitting, his sitting on an object made for reclining, and partial standing-partial reclining (*Torath Cohanim*).²¹

15:5 And a man who touches what he lies upon shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And a man who touches - The clothes of a man who touches the lying place of a zav become unclean, but not those upon a different lying place which touches his lying place (*Ibid.*).²²

And a man who touches - This teaches us that it is only while he touches

it that he renders garments unclean, but when he departs from it, he does not render garments unclean (*Ibid.*).²³

what he lies upon - His lying place is likened to him; just as he can be cleansed in a mikvah, so his lying place can be cleansed in a mikvah (Shabbath 84a).²⁴

what he lies upon [lit., "his lying place"] - "his lying place," and not a stolen one (Bava Kamma 66b).²⁵

what he lies upon - "what he lies upon" — if it is broken, it is clean (Torath Cohanim).²⁶

what he lies upon - "what he lies upon" — and not upon a rope projecting from the bed, less than five *tefachim* or more than ten [in which case it is not considered part of the bed]; "what he lies upon" — and not on strands which project more than three fingers beyond the rope knots (*Ibid.*).^{27,28}

15:6 And one who sits on the object which a zav sits upon shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

on the object - This tells me only of his sitting there while the zav is [sitting] there. Whence do I derive the equivalence of the unoccupied state with the occupied one? From: "the object" [i.e., the object is the criterion, and not the occupation] (*Ibid.*).²⁹

on the object - to include a saddle (Ibid.).30

which a zav sits upon - This tells me only of sitting on it and coming in direct contact with it. Whence do I derive the same rule for sitting on ten layers of seats, one above the other, or even upon a stone under which there is a cavity? From: "And one who sits on the object which a zav sits upon ... shall be unclean" — the place which the zav sits upon and renders unclean, the clean one sits upon and becomes unclean (Ibid.). 31,32

15:7 And he who touches the flesh of the zav shall wash his

clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

the flesh of the zav - "the flesh," and not the dung upon it, and not the hair-knot that is upon it, and not the necklaces, and not the rings or bands (*Ibid.*).^{33,34}

the flesh of the zav - "the flesh of the zav" — and not a bone that separates from him, and not flesh that separates from him (*Ibid.*).³⁵

15:8 And if the zav spit upon one who is clean, he shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And if the zav spit - This tells me only of his spittle. Whence do I derive the same rule for his phlegm, mucus, and nasal flow? From: "And if the zav spit" (Niddah 55b).³⁶

And if the zav spit - The phlegm, mucus, and spittle of the zav render unclean only when wet, and not when dry. Why so? For it is written: "And if the zav spit" — as [at the time of] spitting (*Ibid.* 56a).³⁷

upon one who is clean - I might think [that he becomes unclean] even if it did not touch him; it is, therefore, written: "upon one who is clean" — it must touch the clean one. Let us say, then, that he becomes unclean only when the spittle touches him, but not when it comes to rest on something he is carrying, as in the case of creeping-thing uncleanliness! This is contravened by: "upon [lit., "in"] one who is clean" — what is in the hand of the clean man [i.e., what he is carrying] I have made unclean to you (Ibid. 55b). 38,39

15:9 And every saddle upon which the zav rides shall be unclean.

And every saddle - I might think [that he generates uncleanliness] even if he rode on an article of reclining or of sitting; it is, therefore, written: "saddle," and not the foregoing (*Torath Cohanim*).40

15:10 And anyone who touches anything that was beneath him shall be unclean until the evening; and he who carries them shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

that was beneath him - What is the intent of "beneath him"? If: "beneath the zav," this [rule] is derived from (5): "And a man who touches what he lies upon"! It must mean, then [as is possible in the Hebrew]: "anything that the zav was beneath" — [that is, anything that passed over] the upper part of the zav (Niddah 33a).41

and he who carries them - "them" — this connotes exclusion viz.: "them," and not a cavity-stone (Ibid. 55a).42

15:11 And anyone that the zav touch, if he has not washed his hands with water, shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And anyone that the zav touch - Ulla said: All agree that the tongue is regarded as "exposed" [and, therefore, susceptible of uncleanliness] in respect to [contact by] creeping things. Why so? For it is written: "that the zav touch," and the tongue, too, is capable of touching (Kiddushin 25a).⁴³

And anyone that the zav touch - Resh Lakish said: "And anyone that the zav touch, if he has not washed his hands with water" — this refers to the hesset of the zav [i.e., rendering objects unclean by moving them without actually touching them, e.g., by pressing down on one end of a balance scale] (Niddah 43a).44

if he has not washed his hands - It was taught: R. Elazar b. Arach said: "if he has not washed his hands with water" — From here the sages adduced a Scriptural support for the [Rabbinical] ordinance of washing the hands (Chullin 106a).45

if he has not washed his hands - What is as his hands [requires ablution]; just as his hands are visible, so all that is visible — to exclude concealed areas from the requirement of immersion (Torath Cohanim).⁴⁶

if he has not washed his hands - even after many years (Ibid.).47

15:12 And an earthen vessel which a zav touches shall be broken, and every wooden vessel shall be rinsed in water.

which a zav touches - [lit., "touches in it"] — It is written here: "in it," and, elsewhere (*Ibid.* 6:21): "in which it shall be cooked" — just as there, it is rendered unclean only from the inside, here, too, it is rendered unclean only from the inside [and not by his touching the outside] (*Ibid.*).48

15:13 And when the zav is cleansed of his discharge, then he shall count for himself seven days for his cleansing; and he shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in running water, and he shall be clean.

And when the zav is cleansed - What is the intent of: "And when the zav is cleansed"? When his discharge ceases [and not: when he is cleansed of his state of uncleanliness] (Megillah 8a).⁴⁹

And when the zav is cleansed of his discharge - Of his discharge, and not of his discharge and of his plague-spot [i.e., if he were afflicted by both, he need not wait for the healing of his plague-spot before beginning to count the seven days for his discharge] (*Ibid.*). 50

of his discharge, then he shall count - This ["of," implying that all three sightings are not necessary] teaches us that a zav of two sightings must count the seven days (Ibid.).⁵¹

then he shall count for himself - "for himself" — [he is trusted by] himself (*Ibid.*).⁵²

seven days for his cleansing - What is the intent of: "for his cleansing"? That his cleansing be one [seven-day time period, uninterrupted by a discharge] (*Ibid.*).⁵³

and he shall bathe his flesh in running water - Ulla said: All agree that the tongue, in respect to immerision, is regarded as hidden [and, accordingly, does not require immersion]. Whence is this [principle]

derived? From: "and he shall bathe his *flesh* in running water" — just as his flesh is exposed, so all that is exposed (*Kiddushin* 25a).⁵⁴

and he shall be clean [lit., "and he is clean"] - What is the intent of: "and he is clean"? He is clean now against rendering earthen vessels unclean through hesset [see commentary on 15:11]. Though he may see [a discharge] later [after his immersion in the daytime], they are not rendered unclean retroactively (Megillah 8b).⁵⁵

15:14 And on the eighth day he shall take for himself two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, and he shall come before the L-rd to the door of the tent of meeting, and he shall give them to the priest.

And on the eighth day - in the daytime, and not in the evening (*Torath Cohanim*). 56

he shall take for himself - "for himself" if he had set them aside for his first occasion of zav uncleanliness, he should not bring them for his second (*Ibid.*).⁵⁷

and he shall come before the L-rd - When does he come? After he had immersed himself [in the daytime] and the sun had set [rendering him clean] (Nazir 44b). 58

15:15 And the priest shall offer them up, one as a sin-offering, and the other as a burnt-offering; and the priest shall make atonement for him before the L-rd from his discharge.

And the priest shall offer them up - R. Chisda said: The birds are designated [for their specific sacrificial function (sin-offering or burnt-offering)] only when taken by the owners or when offered by the priest, as it is written (*Ibid.* 12:8): "then she shall take two turtle-doves... one for a burnt-offering and one for a sin-offering," and: "And the priest shall offer them up, one as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering" — either through the taking of the owner or the offering of the priest (*Yoma* 41a).⁵⁹

from his discharge - Some with zav uncleanliness do bring an offering, and some do not. How so? If there were three sightings, he brings; if there were two, he does not bring ["from" implying some and not all] (Megillah 8a).60

15:16 And a man, if there issue from him semen, then he shall bathe all of his flesh with water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And a man - This tells me only of a man [i.e., an adult]. Whence do I derive the same for a youth of nine years and one day [who may have viable semen]? From: "And a man" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Niddah 32b).61

if there issue from him - One does not contract semen uncleanliness until his uncleanliness comes forth on the outside, as it is written: "if there issue from him" (*Ibid.* 43a).⁶²

then he shall bathe, etc. - It was taught: "then he shall bathe all of his flesh with water" — nothing must intervene between his flesh and the water: "with water" — in the water of a mikvah; [lit.,] "with all his flesh" — what is appended to his flesh, i.e., his hair; "all of his flesh" — water in which his entire body can be immersed; and the Rabbis estimated the waters of the mikvah to be forty sa'ah (Eruvin 4b).63

15:17 And every garment and all skin upon which there shall be semen shall be washed in water, and it shall be unclean until the evening.

upon which there shall be semen - It is written here: "semen," and, further (18): "if a man will lie with her, a lying of semen" — just as there [the "semen" referred to is] in its viable state, here, too, it is in its viable state (Torath Cohanim).64

15:18 And a woman, if a man lie with her, a lying of semen, then they shall bathe in water, and they shall be unclean until the evening.

And a woman - This tells me only of a woman. Whence do I derive that a child of three years and one day is also included within this context of "lying"? From: "And a woman" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Niddah 32a).65

if a man lie with her - "a man" — to exclude a minor [in this instance, one younger than nine years and one day] (Torath Cohanim).66

if a man lie with her - "with her" — to exclude unnatural coitus [i.e., sodomy] (Yevamoth 34b).⁶⁷

a lying of semen - to exclude vitiated semen [which she discharges the third day after coitus], such semen not causing uncleanliness (Shabbath 86b).⁶⁸

a lying of semen - to exclude peripheral contact as not causing uncleanliness (Yevamoth 34b).⁶⁹

then they shall bathe in water, and they shall be unclean - R. Shimon said: What does this come to teach us? If the law in respect to touching semen — this is explicitly stated (22:4): "or a man, if there issue forth from him semen ... "! It must be, then, [to teach us something in respect to] uncleanliness in concealment [i.e., in this case, within her womb]. Though normally there is no uncleanliness in concealment, in this case Scripture decrees that there is (Niddah 41b). 70

and they shall be unclean until the evening - And this is so only if she does not turn over [during coitus, so that the semen, solidifying, discharges at one time]; but if she does turn over [in which case, the semen, not coalescing, will be eliminated little by little], she may not eat terumah for three days, it being impossible that she not discharge [for that period of time] (Ibid. 42a).⁷¹

15:19 And a woman, if she have a flow, if blood shall be her flow in her flesh, seven days shall she be in her state of *niddah*; and all who touch her will be unclean until the evening.

And a woman - This tells me only of a woman. Whence do I derive that even a one-day-old infant is included in this context of *niddah*? From:

"And a woman" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Ibid. 44a).72

if she have a flow - I might think that [this applies] even if she flows from any place [on her body]; it is, therefore, written (20:18): "and she has uncovered the source of her blood" — This teaches us about blood that it causes uncleanliness only [if it comes] from the source (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷³

if blood shall be her flow - The blood of the *niddah* causes uncleanliness whether wet or dry. Whence is this derived? R. Yitzchak said: "shall be" connotes extension of inclusion (*Niddah* 54b).⁷⁴

if blood shall be her flow in her flesh - The Rabbis taught: "in her flesh" — this teaches us that her blood generates uncleanliness internally [by issuing from her source] as well as externally [by appearing on the outside]. This tells me only of a niddah. Whence do I derive the same for a zavah? From: "her flow in her flesh" [implying any flow]. Whence do I derive the same for one who discharges semen? From: "shall be" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Ibid. 41b). 75-77

in her flesh - "in her flesh" [i.e., only if the blood issues normally from her flesh], but not [if it is collected] in a tube, and not [if it is found] in the placenta, and not [if it is found] in a piece [of flesh discharged from her womb] (*Ibid.* 21b).^{78,79}

in her flesh - so that she feels it [i.e., the flow] in her flesh (Ibid. 57b).80

seven days shall she be in her state of niddah - I might think that she is permitted to immerse while it is still day; it is, therefore, written: "seven days shall she be in her state of niddah" — she shall be in that state all of the seven days [and she immerses on the night preceding the eighth day] (Pesachim 90b).⁸¹

seven days shall she be in her state of niddah - It was taught: R. Meir says: Why were seven days [of uncleanliness] instituted for the niddah? Since continued association with her makes her distasteful to him, Scripture ruled: Let her be unclean for seven days, so that [afterwards], she will be as beloved by her husband as she was when he took her as a bride (Niddah 31b).⁸²

seven days shall she be in her state of niddah - I might think that [to be

in this state] she must see blood all seven days; it is, therefore, written: "shall she be" — though she does not see [all seven but only one] (Torath Cohanim).⁸³

seven days shall she be in her state of niddah - This tells me only of "days"? Whence do I derive the nights [for inclusion]? From: "shall she be" — to include the nights (*Ibid.*).84

seven days shall she be in her state of niddah - I might think any seven days, whether consecutive or scattered; it is, therefore, written: "shall she be" - their being shall be one [consecutive unit] (*Ibid.*).⁸⁵

and all who touch her will be unclean - I might think that one who touched her would render other men and earthen vessels unclean; it is, therefore, written: "and all who touch her will be unclean" [i.e., they alone, and not others or earthen vessels that they touch] (*Ibid.*).86

- 15:20 And everything that she lies upon in her state of *niddah* shall be unclean; and all that she sits upon shall be unclean.
- 15:21 And whoever touches what she lies upon shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.
- 15:22 And whoever touches any object that she sits upon shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.
- 15:23 And if on the bed he be, or on the object that she sits upon, when he touches it, he shall be unclean until the evening.

or on the object, etc. - "the object" here is a saddle, for it is written: "when he touches it." Respecting which object was a distinction made

between touching it and carrying it [the former rendering one unclean and the latter not]? A saddle (Torath Cohanim).87

that she sits upon - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: Let one always speak with "a clean tongue," for what in respect to a zav [a man with a discharge] is referred to as a "saddle," in respect to a woman is referred to as a "seat" [thus averting the conjuring up of the image associated with "saddle"] (Pesachim 3a).⁸⁸

that she sits upon - "she" [i.e., her body generates this degree of uncleanliness] and not her blood [which was left on the object] (Niddah 54b). 89

15:24 And if a man lie, lie, with her, then her state of *niddah* shall be upon him, and he shall be unclean for seven days; and every lying place on which he lies shall be unclean.

And if a man lie, lie, with her - to include two manners of lying [i.e., natural coitus and unnatural (sodomy)] and to include peripheral contact (*Torath Cohanim*).⁹⁰

And if a man lie, lie, with her - "a man" — to exclude a minor. I might think that one older than nine years and a day [but not yet an adult halachically] is also excluded; it is, therefore, written: "lie, lie" [and one of that age comes within the context of "lying"] (*Ibid.*).91

with her - to exclude a woman leper [i.e., one who has coitus with her does not become unclean as she is] (*Ibid.*).92

then her state of niddah shall be upon him - It was taught: Whence is it derived that cohabitation consummates marriage in a niddah [unlike the case with all others with whom cohabitation invokes the penalty of kareth (cutting-off)]? From: "then her state of niddah shall be upon him" — even in her state of niddah, she is subject to "being" [i.e., marriage] (Yevamoth 49b).93

then her state of niddah shall be upon him - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one commenced coitus when she were clean, and [in the midst of the act] she said: "I have become unclean" [whence is it derived] that he should not separate immediately [but wait (suppressing

ejaculation) until he has lost his erection]? From: "then her state of *niddah* shall be upon him" — even in her time of *niddah* [as in the aforementioned instance], she shall be "upon him" [i.e., close to, and not separated from him] (*Shevuoth* 18b).⁹⁴

then her state of niddah shall be upon him - It was taught: I might think that he followed her schedule [i.e., so that if he cohabited with her on her sixth day, he would immerse, as she, on nightfall of the seventh]; it is, therefore, written: "and he shall be unclean for seven days" (Niddah 33a).95

then her state of niddah shall be upon him - What is the intent of this? I might think that he does not render other men and earthen vessels unclean; it is, therefore, written: "then her state of *niddah* shall be upon him" — just as she renders others and earthen vessels unclean, so does he (*Ibid.*). 96

and every lying place - What is the intent of this? Scripture shunted him from stringency in uncleanliness [(equating him with the *niddah* herself, in point of rendering his lying place unclean)] to leniency in uncleanliness, in point of his lying place, rendering unclean only food and drink [that come in contact with it, and not men and garments, as hers does] (*Ibid.*).97

15:25 And a woman, if the flow of her blood flow many days, not in the time of her *niddah* period; or if she flows beyond her *niddah* period, then all the days of the flow of her uncleanliness, as the days of her *niddah* state shall she be; she is unclean.

And a woman - This tells me only of a woman. Whence do I derive that even a ten-day old infant [seven days for *niddah* and three for *zavah*] is included in the context of *zivah*? From: "And a woman" — connoting extension of inclusion (*Ibid.* 44a).98

And a woman - whether convert, or maidservant, or freed maidservant (Torath Cohanim).99

if the flow of her blood flow - The Rabbis taught: "her blood" — that

which is attributable to her, and not that which comes as a result of childbirth [in the possible zivah days, i.e., the three days after the sevenday niddah period]. But perhaps it is meant to exclude that which is attributable to an external cause [such as jumping and the like]! "If the flow of her blood flow" subsumes external causes. How, then, am I going to understand: "her blood"? As that which is attributable to her, and not that which comes as a result of childbirth (Nidah 36b). 100-103

many days - How many are "many"? Three. I might think that "many" are ten! — It being written: "many days," just as the minimum of "days" is two, so the minimum of "many" is three (*Torath Cohanim*). 104,105

not in the time of her niddah period - "beyond her niddah period" — conjoined with her niddah period [i.e., she does not become a zavah gedolah, "a great zavah" (requiring an offering), unless she sees three days consecutively, immediately following her niddah period; namely, days eight, nine and ten]. Whence do I derive a "skipping" from this niddah period [i.e., Whence do I derive that she is also considered a zavah gedolah if she skipped the eighth day, but saw on days nine, ten, and eleven]? From: "or if she flows." And whence do I derive the eleventh day [after the onset of her zivah period as inclusive in a three-day zavah gedolah occurrence on days eight, nine, and ten (though the seven-day counting period for the first occurrence ends on the tenth day)]? From: "not in the time of her niddah period" (Niddah 73a).¹⁰⁶

beyond her niddah period - R. Shameih said to R. Abba: Let us say that [if she sees] in the daytime she is a zavah [it being written: "many days"], and, if at night, she is a niddah! He answered: It is for one [who questions] such as you that Scripture states: "beyond her niddah period" — conjoined with her niddah period. When can zavah be conjoined with her niddah period? At night [i.e., the night ending her seven-day niddah period], and Scripture refers to her as a zavah! (Ibid.). 107

all the days - I know only of three days [i.e., zavah gedolah uncleanliness]. Whence do I derive two days [of sighting as rendering her a zavah (though not making her liable for an offering)]? From: "days." Whence do I derive one day? From: "all of the days" (Ibid.). 108

she is unclean - "unclean" — This teaches us that she renders the one who cohabits with her unclean, as a niddah does; "she" — she renders the one who cohabits with her unclean, but a zav does not render the one he cohabits with unclean [as a zavah, but as an object of contact with a zav]. And whence is it derived that she generates "lying place" and "sitting place" uncleanliness? From (26): "as the lying place of her niddah period." And this tells me only of a three-day zavah [as producing such uncleanliness]. Whence do I derive the same [rule] for a two-day zavah? From: "days." Whence do I derive the same for a one-day zavah? From: "all the days" (Ibid.). 109-111

15:26 Every lying place which she lies upon all the days of her flow, as the lying place of her *niddah* period shall be to her; and every object which she sits upon shall be unclean, as the uncleanliness of her *niddah* period.

as the lying place of her niddah period shall be to her - It was taught: Whence is it derived that she observes one day [of tentative uncleanliness] for one day [the preceding day, of positive uncleanliness]? From: "shall be to her" [connoting her observation of such a day]. I might think that she counts seven days for two [days of sighting]; it is, therefore, written: "shall be to her" — she counts only her day (Ibid.). 112-114

as the uncleanliness of her niddah period - ["sitting place" uncleanliness of the zavah is] "as the uncleanliness of her niddah period" [i.e., the same degree], but not as the days of her niddah period [but only until evening] (Torath Cohanim). 115

15:27 And whoever touches them shall be unclean. And he shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening.

And whoever touches them - [even] by their projections (Ibid.). 116

15:28 And if she is cleansed of her flow, then she shall count for herself seven days, and after, she shall be clean.

And if she is cleansed of her flow - "of her flow"— and not of her flow and her plague-spot uncleanliness, and not of her flow and her child-birth uncleanliness [see commentary on 12:2] (Niddah 37a).¹¹⁷

then she shall count for herself - It was taught: R. Chinena b. Cahana said in the name of Shmuel: Whence is it derived that a *niddah* is trusted to count by herself? From: "then she shall count for herself" — by herself (*Ketuvoth* 72a).¹¹⁸

and after she shall be clean - after the last [sighting] of all; that is, uncleanliness cannot intervene between them [but there must be seven consecutive clean days]. R. Shimon says: After the fact [i.e., after part of the seventh day has passed], she may cleanse herself; but the sages said: It is forbidden to do this lest she bring herself to doubt [i.e., lest she see blood after her immersion in the daytime and thus contravene the count retroactively] (Niddah 67b).¹¹⁹⁻¹²¹

- 15:29 And on the eighth day she shall take for herself two turtledoves or two young pigeons, and she shall bring them to the priest, to the door of the tent of meeting.
- 15:30 And the priest shall offer up the one as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering, and the priest shall make atonement for her before the L-rd from the flow of her uncleanliness.
- 15:31 And you shall separate the children of Israel from their uncleanliness, and they shall not die in their uncleanliness by defiling My tabernacle which is in their midst.

And you shall separate, etc. - It was taught: Where is the marking of graves intimated in the Torah? Mar Zutra answered: In: "And you shall separate the children of Israel from their uncleanliness" [i.e., by marking their graves so that they will be recognized as places of uncleanliness (Moed Katan 5a). 122

And you shall separate, etc. - R. Yashiyah said: "And you shall separate the children of Israel from their uncleanliness" — this

constitutes an exhortation to the children of Israel to separate from their wives before the expected time of their menstrual flow (*Shevuoth* 18b).¹²³

And you shall separate, etc. - It was taught: R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Shimon b. Yochai: If one does not separate from his wife before the expected time of her menstrual flow, even if he will have sons like the sons of Aaron, they will die, as it is written: "And you shall separate the children of Israel from their uncleanliness... And she who flows with her menstrual flow (33)... after the death of the two sons of Aaron" (16:1) (*Ibid.*). 124

And you shall separate, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one commenced coitus when she were clean, and [in the midst of the act] she said: "I have become unclean" [whence is it derived] that he should not separate immediately [but wait (suppressing the ejaculation) until he has lost his erection]? From: "And you shall separate the children of Israel from their uncleanliness" (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 2:5). 125

by defiling My tabernacle which is in their midst - This teaches us that though they be unclean the Shechinah is among them (*Torath Cohanim*). 126

15:32 This is the law of the zav and of him from whom semen issues forth to be made unclean thereby.

This is the law of the zav - [followed by: "and of him from whom semen issues forth." The zav is being likened to one with a seminal emission]; just as the latter immerses in the daytime, so a zav immerses in the daytime (Megillah 20a).¹²⁷

This is the law of the zav - R. Yochanan said: All [offerings] require the acknowledgement [of the owners] except those [brought for individuals] who are lacking atonement [i.e., individuals such as a zav, a leper, and the like, who are forbidden to enter the sanctuary to partake of the offerings before their "atonement" is brought]. For a man brings an offering on behalf of his young sons or daughters [who are not capable of such acknowledgement], as it is written: "This is the

law of the zav," whether he be an adult or a child (Nedarim 35b). 128,129

This is the law of the zav - whether he be an adult or a child; just as the first sighting of an adult renders him unclean, so the first sighting of a child renders him unclean (Niddah 34b).¹³⁰

This is the law of the zav - R. Huna said: The first sighting of a zav renders him unclean even if externally generated [i.e., by jumping, carrying a heavy burden, and the like], for it is written: "This is the law of the zav and of him from whom semen issues forth" — just as a seminal emission renders one unclean though externally generated, so the first sighting of the zav renders him unclean though the flow be externally generated (*Ibid.* 35a). 131

This is the law of the zav - "This is the law of the zav and of him from whom semen issues forth" — The law of semen is likened to the law of zav; just as a zav generates zav uncleanliness in three days [i.e., three sightings in three days, but not three sightings in four days], so semen [i.e., the semen which she discharges] generates uncleanliness for three days [after coitus. That is, any semen that she discharges within three days of coitus renders unclean] (Yerushalmi Shabbath 9:3). 132

This is the law of the zav - followed by: "and of him from whom semen issues forth." This teaches us that a zav of one sighting immerses and partakes of his Paschal offering in the evening, just as one with a seminal emission (*Torath Cohanim*).¹³³

and of him from whom semen issues forth, etc. - preceded by: "This is the law of the zav"; it is likened to zav — just as a sighting of zivah contravenes [the seven clean-day count of] a zav, so a sighting of semen contravenes it. I might think that the entire seven-day count is contravened by the latter [as it is by the former]; it is, therefore, written: "to be made unclean thereby" — the contravention is only [for a space of time that is] implicit in it [in semen uncleanliness] itself, i.e., one day. I might think that a urinal flow would also contravene this period; it is, therefore, written: "This" [i.e, only semen, which is mentioned in the verse] (Ibid.). 134-136

15:33 And she who flows with her menstrual flow, and he who

flows with his discharge, for male or female, and he who lies with her who is unclean.

And she who flows with her menstrual flow - It was taught: The early elders used to say: "And she who flows with her menstrual flow" — [lit., "in her state of niddah" — i.e., she shall remain cut-off] she shall not paint her eyes, nor rouge herself, nor adorn herself in colored garments — until R. Akiva came and taught: If so, you will make her unbecoming to her husband and will cause him to divorce her! How, then, are we to understand: "And she who flows shall remain in her state of niddah"? She shall remain in it until she immerses in the mikvah (Shabbath 64b). 137-139

And she who flows with her menstrual flow - Whence is it derived that the blood of the *niddah* causes uncleanliness? Chezkiyah said: From: "And she who flows with her menstrual flow" — her flow [i.e., blood] is as she is; just as she causes uncleanliness, so does her flow (Niddah 54b).140

and he who flows with his discharge - His discharge is being likened to him. Just as with him, no distinction is made between touching and carrying uncleanliness, between rendering men and garments unclean, so, with his discharge (*Ibid.* 55b).¹⁴¹

for male or female - The female is being likened to the male. Just as a male brings an offering for certainty [of having transgresed] and for doubt, so a female brings an offering for certainty and for doubt. And just as a male brings the same kind of offering for a doubtful transgression as he does for a certain one, so does a female (Nazir 29a). 142,143

for male or female - In respect of the third sighting [of zivah] he is being likened to a female. Just as a female is rendered unclean [with zivah uncleanliness] by external causes [such as jumping, carrying a burden, and the like], so externally generated zivah produces third-sighting uncleanliness in a male (*Ibid.* 65b). 144

for male or female - The male zav is being likened to the female. Just as a female becomes unclean with [sightings on individual] days [i.e., sightings on three consecutive days make her a zavah gedolah], so a

male becomes unclean with days [and not only with three sightings on one day] (Bava Kamma 24a). 145

for male or female - "for male" — to include [in uncleanliness] the springs [i.e., the mucous discharges] of a leper; "or female" — to include the springs [i.e., the child-birth blood] of a leper (Niddah 34b).¹⁴⁶

with her who is unclean - to include one who lives with a zavah observing one day [of tentative uncleanliness] for one day [the preceding day, of positive uncleanliness (see commentary on [26])] (Torath Cohanim).¹⁴⁷

Acharei Moth

16:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron when they drew near before the L-rd and they died.

after the death, etc. - It was taught: Why is their death mentioned in conjunction with Yom Kippur? To teach that just as Yom Kippur atones for the Jews, so the death of the righteous atones for the Jews (Yerushalmi Yoma 1:1).

after the death of the two sons of Aaron - It was taught: Whence is it derived that just as the transgression of the two was identical, so the death of the two was identical. From: "after the death of the two sons of Aaron [connoting that the death was common to the two of them] (Torath Cohanim).²

16:2 And the L-rd said to Moses: Speak to Aaron your brother, and let him not come at all times to the holy place within the curtain before the ark-cover which is on the ark, that he not die; for in the cloud I shall appear upon the ark-covering.

Speak to Aaron your brother - "your brother" — to include his children (*Ibid.*).³

and let him not come at all times, etc. - "at all times" — this refers to Yom Kippur; "to the holy place" — to include the other days of the year (*Ibid.*).4

to the holy place, etc. - to the holy place [i.e., the sanctuary] he is exhorted not to *come*; within the curtain before the ark-cover he incurs the penalty of death (*Menachoth* 27b).⁵

which is on the ark - What is the intent of this? It being written "kaporeth" [(here translated as "ark-cover")], I might think that [in addition to the kaporeth"] there is a covering for the ark; it is, therefore, written: "which is on the ark" — the kaporeth is on the ark, and there is no [other] cover on the ark (Torath Cohanim).6

that he not die, etc. - It was taught: R. Eliezer says: "that he not die"—this is the punishment; "for in the cloud I shall appear"—this is the exhortation. I might think that both were stated before the death of the sons of Aaron; it is, therefore, written: "after the death of the two sons of Aaron." I might think that both were stated after the death of the sons of Aaron; it is, therefore, written: "for in the cloud I shall appear" [the implication being that He had not yet appeared — whereas He had appeared on the day of their death!]. How, then, is this to be understood? The exhortation was stated before their death and the punishment after their death (Yoma 53a).

for in the cloud I shall appear - This teaches us that an herb which caused the smoke to rise [as a pillar] was put into the incense [which was smoked on Yom Kippur] (*Ibid.*).8

for in the cloud I shall appear - R. Zeira said: It is not written: "For in the cloud I did appear," but: "For in the cloud I shall appear." This teaches us that the Holy One Blessed be He does not punish without first exhorting (Yerushalmi Yoma 1:5).

16:3 With this shall Aaron come to the Holy place: with a young bullock for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering.

With this shall Aaron come - [What is the intent of "With this"?] With what was stated in this respect. And what is that? What was ordained in respect to the consecration of the priests [i.e., the seven-day separation period; in this case, before Yom Kippur] (Yoma 4a).¹⁰

to the holy place - to include the holy place which does not contain the ark and the ark-cover (Torath Cohanim).¹¹

with a young bullock - Now is it then brought up by its horns! The intent is: with its blood [from here it is derived that the blood is called

"bullock." Therefore, if the priest slaughtered the bullock and died before making atonement with its blood, the succeeding priest enters with this blood (which may be regarded as his bullock) and makes atonement with it] (Yoma 50a).¹²

16:4 A holy linen tunic shall he wear, and linen breeches shall be upon his flesh, and with a linen girdle shall he gird himself, and a linen mitre shall he place upon his head; they are holy garments. And he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall put them on.

A holy linen tunic, etc. - "linen, linen, linen, linen" [four times in this verse] - the choicest of linens is hereby connoted (*Ibid.* 35a).¹³

A holy linen tunic, etc. - Why white garments? R. Chiyya said: As the ministration above, so is the ministration below. Just as above (*Ezekiel* 9:2): "and one man among them was clothed in linen," so, below: "A holy linen tunic shall he wear" (*Yerushalmi Yoma* 7:2).¹⁴

A holy linen tunic, etc. - See Exodus 28:42, 30:21, and Leviticus 6:3

A holy linen tunic shall he wear - Why mention [independently]: "he shall wear," "he shall gird," "he shall place upon his head"? Since we invest him with other garments at twilight, we might think that if the latter were lacking, he should not wear those of the morning; it is, therefore, written: "he shall wear," "he shall gird," "he shall place upon his head" (Torath Cohanim). 15

they are holy garments - It was taught: Rebbi said: Whence are derived the five immersions and the ten lustrations performed by the high priest on Yom Kippur? From: "A holy linen tunic shall he wear... and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall put them on." And it is written: "they are holy garments" — all of the garments are likened to each other [and since there are five changings, there are five immersions and ten lustrations (washing of hands and feet for each doffing and donning)] (Yoma 32a). 16

they are holy garments - This is the archetype for the purchase of all such garments from Temple funds (*Torath Cohanim*). 17

and he shall put them on - The Rabbis taught: If the high priest did not immerse and did not wash between garment and garment and between service and service, and he performed his service, it is valid; for it is written: "and he shall put them on" — donning them is a categorical requirement, but nothing else (Zevachim 19b). 18

and he shall put them on - [Heb.] "Uleveisham" — "Uvalu sham" [lit., "and they shall rot there"; i.e., they shall not be used again] (Yerushalmi Yoma 7:3). 19

16:5 And from the congregation of the children of Israel he shall take two he-goats for a sin-offering and one ram for a burnt-offering.

And from the congregation of the children of Israel - This teaches us that they come from [i.e., are funded by] the community (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁰

two he-goats - The minimum of "he-goats" is two. Why, then, is it necessary to state: "two"? That the two of them be alike in all respects. Whence is it derived that if they are not thus alike the offering is, nevertheless, valid? From: "he-goat" (9); "he-goat" (10) [connoting de facto validity with] any he-goat (Yoma 62b). 21,22

two he-goats - Whence is derived the principle of the sages: "Go according to the majority"? R. Acha b. Yaakov said: It is derived from the instance of the scapegoat, for it is written: "two he-goats" — that the two of them be alike in all respects. Now let us be concerned that one of them [i.e., the scapegoat] might be treifah [organically defective]! We must say, then, [since we are not thus concerned] that we go according to the majority [of animals, which are not treifah] (Chullin 11a).²³

and one ram - It was taught: Rebbi said: The "one ram" mentioned here is the same as that mentioned in the *Book of Numbers* (29:8). How do we know this [i.e., that the same, and not an additional ram is intended]? For it is written: "one" (Yoma 70b).²⁴

16:6 And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin-offering which is his, and he shall make atonement for himself and for his household.

which is his - It was taught: "which is his"—he brings of his own and not of the community [i.e., funded by himself and not by them]. I might think that he is permitted to bring that of his brother priests; it is, therefore, written (11): "which is his." I might think that if he did bring it, it is valid; it is, therefore, written again (*Ibid.*): "which is his"—Scripture repeats it to make it a categorical requirement (*Ibid.* 51b). 25,26

which is his - He brings of his own, and not of ma'aser [the tithe] (Menachoth 83a).²⁷

and he shall make atonement - Scripture is speaking of verbal atonement. But perhaps it is speaking of atonement through the [sprinkling of the] blood! It is written: "And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin-offering, which is his" — and the bullock has not yet been slaughtered [It is obvious, then, that verbal atonement is intended] (Yoma 36b).^{28,29}

and he shall make atonement for himself, etc. - The Rabbis taught: The bullock of the anointed priest and the bullock of the congregation stand — the bullock of the anointed priest takes precedence. Why so? Since the anointed priest makes atonement, and the congregation receives atonement, it follows that the maker should take precedence to the receiver; and thus, indeed, is it written (17): "and he shall make atonement for himself and for his household and for the entire congregation of Israel" (Horiyoth 13a). 30

and for his household - "his household" — this is his wife. And it is for one household [that he makes atonement] and not for two [The high priest may not have two wives] (Yoma 2a, 13a).31

16:7 And he shall take the two he-goats and he shall stand them before the L-rd at the door of the tent of meeting.

16:8 And Aaron shall place on the two he-goats lots, one lot for the L-rd, and the other lot for Azazel.

lots - What is the intent of this? That they both be alike; that one not be of gold and the other of silver, that one not be large and the other small (*Ibid.* 37a).³²

one lot, etc. - I might think that he writes both names on one lot and both on the other [and places them on the goats]; it is, therefore, written: "one lot for the L-rd" — there is only one for the L-rd and one for Azazel. I might think that he places one for the L-rd and one for Azazel on one goat, and one for the L-rd and one for Azazel on the other; it is, therefore, written: "one lot for the L-rd" — there is only one for the L-rd and one for Azazel (*Ibid.*).³³

and the other lot for Azazel - I might think, since we find that the name of the L-rd was written on the high priest's frontlet, which was made of gold, that it, [the lot] too, should be of gold; it is, therefore, written: "lot," "lot," for extension of inclusion — to include olive-wood, to include nut-wood, to include box-wood (*Ibid.*).^{34,35}

for Azazel - What is "Azazel"? One taught: that it [the place to which it is sent] be hard and rugged. I might think [that it is sent] within the pale; it is, therefore, written (22): "in the desert." And whence is it derived [that it must be sent to] a precipice? From (Ibid.): "cutting" [as a precipice is, jagged]. And another taught: "Azazel" — the mightiest of the mountains, as it is written (Ezekiel 17:13): "and he has taken away the mighty ["eilei"] of the land." And the school of R. Yishmael taught: "Azazel" — it atones for the act of Uzza and Azael [destructive angels associated with profligacy] (Ibid. 67b). 36-39

16:9 And Aaron shall present the he-goat on which the lot came up for the L-rd, and he shall make it a sin-offering.

on which the lot came up - The Rabbis taught: If it were stated: "upon which the lot was," I would say that it must remain upon it until the slaughtering; it is, therefore, written: "on which the lot came up" — once it came up [out of the drawing box] it is no longer needed (*Ibid*. 40b). 40

and he shall make it a sin-offering - [How does he "make" it? He calls it by name] and he says: "For the L-rd, a sin-offering" (*Ibid.* 39a).⁴¹

and he shall make it a sin-offering - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall make it a sin-offering" — It is the *lot* that makes it a sin-offering and not the name [i.e., the verbal designation] which makes it a sin-offering (*Ibid.* 40b).⁴²

16:10 And the he-goat on which the lot came up for Azazel shall be stood living before the L-rd, to make atonement over it, to send it to Azazel to the desert.

shall be stood living - And how long must it be kept alive? Until the sprinkling of the blood of its mate (*Ibid.* 65a).⁴³

to send it - It is one that he sends and not two [i.e., in the event of another lot having been taken because of the spilling of the blood of the first sin-offering] Why so? For it is writen: "it" (Ibid. 62a).44

to the desert - It was taught: "to the desert" (here), "to the desert" (21), "in the desert" (22) — to include Nov and Givon, Shiloh, and Beth Olamim (*Ibid.* 67b).⁴⁵

- 16:11 And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin-offering which is his, and he shall make atonement for himself and for his household, and he shall slaughter the bullock of the sin-offering which is his.
- 16:12 And he shall take a full coal-pan of coals of fire from off the altar before the L-rd and his full handfuls of incense of spices ground small, and he shall bring them within the curtain.

And he shall take a full coal-pan of coals of fire - If "coals," I might think that dying coals were intended; it is, therefore, written: "fire." If: "fire," I might think that he should bring half-coal, half-brand, so that by the time he entered [the holy of holies] it would be all coal; it is,

therefore, written: "And he shall take... coals of fire" — at the time of taking they shall be coals. How is this effected? He brings glowing coals (*Pesachim 75b*).46

from off the altar before the L-rd - Which is the altar, part of which, but not all of which, is before the L-rd? The outer altar [its western side, which is close to the sanctuary entrance, being considered "before the L-rd"] (Yoma 45b).⁴⁷

and his full handfuls - as people usually grab [i.e., with the bottom edge of the hand] (*Ibid.* 47b).⁴⁸

and his full handfuls - The taller, relative to his size, and the shorter, relative to his [i.e., there is no absolute measure for the handful] (Torath Cohanim).⁴⁹

incense of spices - "incense" — to be supplied from cummunal funds; "spices" — all the eleven spices [enumerated in *Exodus, Ki Tisa*] to be contained therein (*Ibid.*).⁵⁰

ground small - What is the intent of: "ground small"? Is it not already stated (*Exodus* 30:26): "And you shall crush it fine"? [The intent, however is, that] though the entire year it is ground fine, on Yom Kippur it must be ground extra fine (*Yoma* 45a).⁵¹

16:13 And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the L-rd, and the cloud of incense shall cover the ark-cover which is upon the Testimony, and he shall not die.

And he shall put ... before the L-rd - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the L-rd" [in the holy of holies] — that he not prepare it first on the outside and then enter — as opposed to the view of the Sadducees, who said that it should be prepared on the outside and then brought in (*Ibid.* 53a).⁵²

and the cloud of incense shall cover - This teaches us that he puts into it an herb which causes the smoke to rise [as a pillar]. [But was this not already derived from (2): "for in the cloud I shall appear"?] R. Ashi answered: One verse is for the *mitzvah*; the other, for establishing it as a categorical requirement (*Ibid.*). 53,54

16:14 And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and he shall sprinkle with his finger upon the ark-cover to the east, and before the ark-cover shall he sprinkle seven times of the blood with his finger.

upon the ark-cover [lit., "on the face of the ark-cover"] - "face" is not less than a tefach [a hand-breadth], and it is written: "on the face of the ark-cover." This teaches us that the height of the ark-cover was a tefach (Succah 5a).⁵⁵

on the face of the ark-cover to the east - It was taught in the school of R. Eliezer b. Yaakov: This is the archetype for "face" always connoting "east" (Yoma 55a).56

shall he sprinkle seven times - What is the intent of: "shall he sprinkle" [it having already been stated: "and he shall sprinkle"]? It teaches us that the first sprinkling [upon the ark-cover] must be re-counted with all the [seven] subsequent sprinklings [before the ark-cover, so that he counts: "One and one; one and two, etc."] (*Ibid.*).57

seven times - seven times, and not seven drops (Torath Cohanim).58

16:15 And he shall slaughter the he-goat of the sin-offering which is the people's, and he shall bring its blood inside the curtain; and he shall do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and he shall sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover.

as he did with the blood of the bullock - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover." We have learned how many above [i.e., upon the ark-cover] for the he-goat — one ["and he shall sprinkle it" implies one], and how many below [i.e., before the ark-cover] for the bullock — seven; but I do not know how many below for the he-goat and how many above for the bullock. It is, therefore, written: "and he shall do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bullock." What is the intent of: "as he did"? That all of its doings be alike. Just as there are seven below for the bullock, there are to be seven below for the he-goat; and just as there is one above for the he-goat, there is to be one above for the bullock (Yoma 55a). 59-61

upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover - It was taught: When he sprinkles, he does not sprinkle directly upon the ark-cover, but beside its projection. When he sprinkles above, the back of his hand is inclined downwards [i.e., facing the ground], and when he sprinkles below, the back of his hand is inclined upwards. Whence is this derived? From: "and he shall sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover." It is not necessary to discuss "below" [i.e., "before the ark-cover"] in respect to the he-goat, for it is derived from "below" of the bullock [see commentary above]. Why, then, is it stated? To liken "upon" to "before" — just as "before" is not "upon" [the ark-cover itself, but on the ground before it], so "upon" is not [directly] upon (Ibid.). 62,63

16:16 And he shall make atonement for the holy place from the uncleanliness of the children of Israel, and from their offenses of all of their sins; and so shall he do for the tent of meeting that dwells with them in the midst of their uncleanliness.

from the uncleanliness of the children of Israel - The Rabbis taught: I might think that the he-goat atones for the transgressions of idol worship, illicit relations, and the spilling of blood, which are called "uncleanliness"; it is, therefore, written: "from the uncleanlinesses," and not all the uncleanlinesses. And which are those [uncleanlinesses that it atones for]? The defiling of the sanctuary and of the sanctified objects, which Scripture distinguished from all other uncleanlinesses by making them subject to an oleh-veyored [lit., "up and down"] offering, i.e., one which differs relative to the means of the donor]; here, too, Scripture distinguished them in respect to atonement. In that case, let us include [as receiving atonement] a woman who has given birth and a leper and a Nazirite [who also bring oleh-veyored offerings] [These are not included, for] it is written: "of all of their sins," and not "of all their uncleanliness" (Shevuoth 7b. 8a). 64-67

and from their offenses of all of their sins - [For] awareness of uncleanliness, where there is awareness in the beginning [i.e., where he is aware that he has become unclean], but there is no awareness at the end [i.e., where he is not aware that he has touched a sanctified object in his state of uncleanliness], the he-goat which is presented within and

Yom Kippur suspend [his judgment] until he becomes aware and brings an offering. Whence is this derived? From: "and from their offenses of all of their sins" [i.e., He is shielded from judgment] of those offenses which [when he becomes aware of them] will result in a sin-offering (Ibid. 8b).68

and from their offenses of all of their sins - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall make atonement for the holy place from the uncleanlinesses of the children of Israel, and from their offenses of all of their sins" — "offenses" [peshaim] refers to acts of rebellion [i.e., deliberate sins], as it is written (II Kings 3:7): "The king of Moav rebelled [pasha] against me"; "sins" refers to unwitting sins, as it is written (Leviticus 4:2): "A soul, if it sin unwittingly." From here it is derived that for intentional defiling of the sanctuary and of sanctified objects the he-goat presented within and Yom Kippur atone (Ibid. 12b).69

and so shall he do for the tent of meeting - What is the intent of this? That just as he sprinkles the blood in the holy of holies, so shall he do in the sanctuary. Just as in the holy of holies [he sprinkles] one above and seven below of the blood of the bullock, and one above and seven below of the blood of the he-goat, so shall he do in the sanctuary (Yoma 56b).70

who dwells with them - The Rabbis taught: "for in the cloud I shall appear upon the ark-cover" (2) — this teaches us that he puts into the incense an herb which causes the smoke to rise [as a pillar]. This tells me only [of his doing so] in the tent of meeting. Whence do I derive the same rule for the sanctuary of Shiloh and for the Temple? From: "and thus shall he do for the tent of meeting that dwells with them in the midst of their uncleanliness" [and the others, too, are such dwellings] (Ibid. 53a).⁷¹

in the midst of their uncleanliness - [What is intended by: "in the midst of their uncleanliness"?] Even when they are unclean, the Shechinah resides among them (*Ibid.* 56b)."

16:17 And no man shall be in the tent of meeting when he comes to make atonement in the holy place until he goes out.

And he shall make atonement for himself, and for his

household, and for the entire congregation of Israel.

And no man - What is the intent of: "And no" [lit., "And all"] — to include even those of whom it is written (*Ezekiel* 1:10).: "And the likeness of their [i.e., the angels'] faces was as the face of a man" (*Yerushalmi Yoma* 1:5).⁷³

And no man, etc. - I might think that this applies even in the azarah [i.e., the Temple court]; it is, therefore, written: "in the tent of meeting." This tells me only of the tent of meeting in the desert. Whence do I derive that the same rule applies for the sanctuary of Shiloh and for the Temple? From: "to make atonement in the holy place." This tells me only [that no one shall be there] at the time of the smoking of the incense. Whence do I derive that the same applies for the time of the sprinkling of the blood? From: "when he comes to make atonement" [which is done by the sprinkling of the blood]. This tells me only [that no one shall be there] upon his entering. Whence do I derive that the same applies upon his leaving? From: "until he goes out" (Yoma 44a)."

And he shall make atonement for himself, etc. - Which atonement embraces him, his household, and his brother priests? That of the smoking of the incense (*Ibid.*).⁷⁵

And he shall make atonement for himself, etc. - It was taught: "And he shall make atonement for himself, and for his household, and for the entire congregation of Israel" — his own atonement comes before that of his household; that of his household comes before that of his brother priests; and that of his brother priests comes before that of the entire congregation of Israel (*Ibid.*). ⁷⁶

16:18 And he shall go out to the altar which is before the L-rd, and make atonement upon it. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the he-goat, and he shall place it upon the corners of the altar roundabout.

And he shall go out to the altar - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall go out to the altar" — What is the intent of this? [i.e., Is he not already standing in the sanctuary, where the golden altar is found?] R.

Nechemiah answered: Since we find in respect to the bullock that is brought for all the *mitzvoth* [i.e., the bullock of the anointed priest] that the priest stands outside [i.e., at the far end of] the altar and sprinkles upon the curtain, I might think that the same applies here; it is, therefore, written: "And he shall go out [to the far end of] the altar. Where was he, [then, until now]? On the inside of the altar [before the curtain] (*Ibid.* 58b).^{77,78}

And he shall go out to the altar - until he passes beyond the entire altar, which indicates that he does not officiate at the first corner [i.e., the western,] that he encounters (*Ibid.*).⁷⁹

to the altar, etc. - "to the altar" — this is the golden [inner] altar (*Ibid.*).80

of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the he-goat - they must be intermixed (*Ibid.* 57b).⁸¹

of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the he-goat - But is not the blood of the bullock more than the blood of the he-goat? [Why, then, does the former not nullify the latter and leave us only with the blood of the bullock — an unacceptable situation!] From here it is derived, however, that those things which go up [on the altar] do not nullify each other (Menachoth 22a).82

upon the corners, etc. - How does he sprinkle? He begins from the northeast corner [and then proceeds] northwest, southwest, southeast. Where he begins, [sprinkling the blood] of the sin-offering upon the outer altar, there he concludes [the sprinkling of the mixed bloods] upon the inner altar (Yoma 58b). 83,84

16:19 And he shall sprinkle upon it of the blood with his finger seven times; and he shall cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleanlinesses of the children of Israel.

and he shall cleanse it - This teaches us that he sprinkles upon the "clean spot" of the altar. Which is its "clean spot"? Its revealed spot [i.e., After sprinkling upon the corners, he moves the coals and the ashes on the altar aside and sprinkles on the area that has been cleared],

as it is written (Exodus 24:10): "and as the very heaven for clearness" (Ibid. 59a).85

and he shall cleanse it and hallow it - From the place that he hallowd it, there shall he cleanse it. From here it is derived that where he concludes the sprinkling on the corners, there he sprinkles upon its top (*Ibid.*).86

and he shall cleanse it - From here it is derived that purity leads to holiness (Yerushalmi Shabbath 1:3).87

and he shall cleanse it and hallow it - He cleanses it from the past and hallows it for the future (*Torath Cohanim*).⁸⁸

16:20 And when he has finished making atonement for the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar, then he shall draw near the living he-goat.

And when he has finished making atonement - What is the intent of: "And when he has finished making atonement"? First he finishes [the atonement of] the blood of the bullock, and then he finishes [the atonement of] the blood of the he-goat (Yoma 57a). 89,90

And when he has finished making atonement - This teaches us that if one of the sprinklings were omitted it is as if nothing were done (*Ibid*. 60b). 91

And when he has finished making atonement - This teaches us that zeal [in this case, in the sacrificial service,] leads to cleanliness (Yerushalmi Shabbath 1:3). 92

then he shall draw near the living he-goat - Until this point [(the sprinkling of the blood)] he must be alive [Otherwise, the blood must be spilled out] (*Torath Cohanim*).⁹³

16:21 And Aaron shall place his two hands on the head of the living goat, and he shall confess over it all the transgressions of the children of Israel, and all their offenses of all of their sins, and he shall place them on the

head of the he-goat, and he shall send him by the hand of an appointed man to the desert.

his two hands - It is written: "yado" ["his hand"], and, yet, it is written: "two." This is the archetype for the rule that wherever "yado" is written two hands are understood, unless Scripture specifies one. From here it is derived that "placing" [of the hands on sacrifices] is with two hands (Menachoth 93b).94

and he shall confess over it - And thus did he say: "I pray You, O L-rd: The children of Israel have sinned, and transgressed, and offended before You. I pray, in the Name of the L-rd: Atone, I beg You, the sins, and the transgressions, and the offenses that Your people, the House of Israel, have sinned, and transgressed, and offended before You" (Yoma 66a). 95

and he shall confess over it - R. Tanchuma said in the name of Resh Lakish: When the Holy One Blessed be He said to Moses: "and he shall confess over it, etc.," Moses began to say the Psalm of Thanksgiving (Psalms 100), the root of the two ["confession" and "thanksgiving"] being the same (Yerushalmi Shevuoth 1:5).96

all the transgressions - "transgressions" refers to deliberate sins, as it is written (Numbers 15:31): "its [the soul's] transgression is in it" (Yoma 36b).⁹⁷

their offenses of all of their sins - Sins are being likened to offenses. Just as there are no offerings for offenses, so, the "sins" referred to here are such for which there are no offerings [such as the eating of neveilah], but those for which there are offerings are not atoned for [by Yom Kippur, but by their offerings] (Krituth 25b).98

by the hand of an appointed man - The Rabbis taught: "man" — this permits a non-priest; "appointed" — that he be readied [the preceding day]; "appointed" — even on the Sabbath, and even if he is in a state of uncleanliness (Yoma 66a). 99-101

16:22 And the he-goat shall bear upon itself all of their

transgressions to the land of gezeirah, and he shall send out the he-goat in the desert.

And the he-goat shall bear upon itself - It bears them upon itself, no other he-goats performing this function (Torath Cohanim). 102

to the land of gezeirah - "gezeirah" refers to cutting [in this case, a cutting, jagged mountain]. Another interpretation: "gezeirah" refers to something that is cut and precipitated downwards [as this he-goat is precipitated down the mountain]. Yet another: "gezeirah" ["decree"] "I, the L-rd, have decreed it, and you are not permitted to bethink yourself of it" (Yoma 67b). 103,104

and he shall send out - after which it is written (5): "And the fat of the sin-offering he shall cause to smoke"; this teaches us that he may begin no other service until the he-goat reaches the desert (Rashi, *Ibid.* b.).¹⁰⁵

16:23 Then Aaron shall come to the tent of meeting, and he shall take off the linen garments which he put on when he went into the holy place, and he shall leave them there.

Then Aaron shall come, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "Then Aaron shall come to the tent of meeting" — Why did he come? [i.e., Wasn't he already there?] He came for no other reason than to take out the censer and the coal-pan (for this entire section follows sequentially except for this verse) [and what follows it] (*Ibid.* 32a). 106,107

and he shall take off, etc. - It is written: "and he shall take off... (24) and he shall wash... and he shall put on" — Taking off is likened to putting on; just as in putting on garments, when he is dressed he washes his hands and feet, so, in [preparation for] taking off garments, while he is still dressed he washes his hands and feet (*Ibid.* 31b). 108

and he shall take off, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that every immersion requires two lustrations [washing of hands and feet]? From: "and he shall take off...(24) and he shall wash, and he shall wash [i.e., "and he shall wash," being sequentially out of place, is understood to apply to what precedes (the taking-off) and to what

follows (the putting-on)] ... and he shall put on" (Ibid. 32a). 109,110

which he put on - What is the intent of: "which he put on"? Does a man take off what he did not put on? The intent, then, must be to liken taking-off to putting on. Just as putting-on requires lustration, so does taking-off (*Ibid.*).¹¹¹

which he put on - which he had already put on. [This teaches us that between the service of the day and the taking out of the censer and the coal-pan he changes his garments] (*Ibid.* 71a).¹¹²

and he shall leave them there - This teaches us that they require genizah [i.e., they are to be stored away, not to be used again] (Pesachim 26a).¹¹³

- 16:24 And he shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place, and he shall put on his garments, and he shall go out and offer up his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and he shall make atonement for himself and for the people.
- 16:25 And the fat of the sin-offering he shall cause to smoke upon the altar.

he shall cause to smoke - "he shall cause to smoke" — even on the Sabbath; even if he is in a state of uncleanliness (Torath Cohanim).¹¹⁴

16:26 And he who sends the he-goat to Azazel shall bathe his flesh in water, and then he may come to the camp.

And he who sends - The Rabbis taught: The sender renders garments unclean, but not the sender of the sender [i.e., those who accompany him] (Yoma 67b). 115

And he who sends, etc. - I might think that as soon as he goes beyond the wall of the azarah [the Temple court] he is unclean; it is, therefore, written: "he who sends," If: "he who sends," I might think [that he is

not unclean] until he reaches Tsok [the mountain from which the goat was precipitated]; it is, therefore, written: "And he who sends" [connoting extension of sending]. When, then, does he become unclean? When he goes outside the wall of Jerusalem (Ibid.).116

16:27 And the bullock of the sin-offering and the he-goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the holy place, he shall take outside the camp; and they shall burn in fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.

And the bullock of the sin-offering, etc. - What is the intent of [the repetition of] "sin-offering"? Since we learn only that the bullock and the he-goat of Yom Kippur which are burnt at the ash-mound render garments unclean, whence do we derive that the same holds for the other [sin-] offerings which are so burned? From: "sin-offering," "sin-offering" (Zevachim 83a). 117

outside the camp - The Rabbis taught: Elsewhere, [in respect to the bullock of the congregation and the bullock of the anointed priest,] you give them three camps [i.e., they must be burned outside of three camps, viz., the azarah, the Temple mount, and Jerusalem], and here you give them only one camp! [It is obviously not meant to be understood, then, that they are to be burned outside of one camp.] What, then, is the intent of: "outside the camp"? To teach that as soon as he leaves one camp, they render garments unclean (Yoma 68a).^{118,119}

their skins, etc. - It was taught: It is written here: "skin, flesh, and dung," and, in respect to the bullock of the anointed priest: "skin, flesh, and dung." Just as there, [the skin is sectioned] through slicing [pieces together with the flesh], and not through flaying; here, too, through slicing and not through flaying (*Ibid.* 67b). 120

16:28 And he who burns them shall wash his clothes and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and then he shall come to the camp.

And he who burns - The Rabbis taught: "And he who burns" — "He who burns" renders garments unclean, and not he who lights the fire,

and not he who arranges the pile. And who is "He who burns"? He who tends the fire itself (*Ibid.* 68b). 121

And he who burns - ["And he who burns," "And he who sends" (26). Just as "And he who sends" is written after its subject (the burning of the fat of the sin-offering), but is understood as occurring before it, "And he who burns," too, though written after its subject, is understood as occurring before it] (*Ibid.* 71a). 122

And he who burns them - The Rabbis taught: I might think that even when they have been reduced to ashes they render clothing unclean; it is, therefore, written: "them" — they render clothing unclean, but not their ashes (Ibid. 68b).¹²³

16:29 And it shall be to you an everlasting statute: in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, you shall afflict your souls. And all work you shall not do, the citizen and the stranger that sojourns in your midst.

you shall afflict your souls - The Rabbis taught: "you shall afflict your souls" — I might think that one should sit in the sun or in the cold to afflict himself; it is, therefore, written afterwards: "And all work you shall not do" — just as [what is stated in respect to] work is passive [i.e., abstaining from work], so [what is stated in respect to] affliction of soul is passive [i.e., abstaining from food, drink, etc.] (Ibid. 74b).¹²⁴

you shall afflict your souls - The following are forbidden on Yom Kippur: eating and drinking, washing, anointing with oil, the wearing of shoes, and cohabitation. To what do these five afflictions correspond? R. Chisda answered: To the five references to affliction in the Torah: (Numbers 28:7): "And on the tenth day... and you shall afflict," (Leviticus 23:27): "But on the tenth day... and you shall afflict," (Ibid. 32): "It is a Sabbath of Sabbaths... and you shall afflict," (here): "And it shall be to you... and you shall afflict," and (31): "It is a Sabbath of Sabbaths... and you shall afflict." (Ibid. 76a). 125,126

you shall afflict your souls - you shall afflict your souls - [It was taught: Though five things were forbidden on Yom Kippur, kareth (cutting-off) is incurred only for eating and drinking; for it is written: "you shall

afflict your souls," and (*Ibid.* 23:29): "For every soul that does not afflict itself... shall be cut off" (The reference is to) a type of affliction which results in the cutting-off of the soul. And which is that? (Abstaining from) eating and drinking)] (*Yerushalmi Yoma* 8:1). 127

And all work - It is written here: "work," and, in respect to the construction of the tabernacle: "work." Just as there, the work involved is the result of deliberation [i.e., doing what one *intended* to do]; here, too, the work involved is the result of deliberation (*Torath Cohanim*). 128

And all work - "all work" — to include even partial work, and even the work of a mitzvah, and even work which does not incur the punishment of kareth (Ibid.). 129

the citizen - to include women (Succah 28a). 130

and the stranger that sojourns in your midst - "and the stranger" — to include the wives of strangers; "in your midst" — to include women and servants (*Torath Cohanim*). 131, 132

16:30 For on this day He shall atone for you to cleanse you of all of your sins; before the L-rd you shall be clean.

For on this day - "on this day" — Though there be no offerings and no he-goat, the day — Yom Kippur itself — atones (*Ibid.*). 133

He shall atone for you - R. Yishmael expounded: If one transgressed a negative commandment and repented, repentance suspends [the punishment] and Yom Kippur atones, as it is written: "For on this day He shall atone for you... of all of your sins" (Yoma 86a). 134

of all of your sins before the L-rd - R. Elazar b. Azaryah expounded: "of all of your sins; before the L-rd you shall be clean" — From here it is derived that transgressions between man and G-d Yom Kippur atones for, but transgressions between man and his neighbor Yom Kippur does not atone for until he conciliates his neighbor (*Ibid.* 85b).¹³⁵

before the L-rd you shall be clean - Those who were liable for suspended guilt-offerings [brought in instances of doubt as to whether a

sin has actually been committed] — if Yom Kippur passes, they are exempt from bringing them after Yom Kippur, it being written: "of all your sins before the L-rd you shall be clean" — those sins which are known only to the L-rd, Yom Kippur atones for (Krituth 25b). 136

16:31 It is a Sabbath of Sabbaths to you, and you shall afflict your souls; it is an everlasting statute.

It is a Sabbath of Sabbaths - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one unwittingly performed a labor on Yom Kippur that fell on a Sabbath he is responsible for each individually? From: "It is a Sabbath"; it is Yom Kippur [i.e., each is regarded as being distinct] (Chullin 101b).¹³⁷

16:32 And the priest shall make atonement, who shall be anointed and who shall be invested with the priesthood in place of his father; and he shall put on the linen garments, the holy garments.

And the priest shall make atonement - It was taught: Whence is it derived that even another [i.e., not a lineal descendant] may be appointed [as a high-priest]? From: "And the priest [any high-priest] shall make atonement" (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 3:2). 138

who shall be anointed - What is the intent of this? I would think that only if he wore the many garments [(The high-priest wears eight garments as opposed to the priest's four)] for seven days [the seven days of consecration] and was anointed for seven days [then his consecration is valid]. Whence do I derive [that it is valid even] if he wore the many garments one day and was anointed one day? From: "who shall be anointed and who shall be invested" — in any event (Yoma 5a). 139,140

in place of his father - This teaches us that the son takes precedence [for appointment to the high-priesthood] to all others. I might think that this is so even if he cannot [properly] fill his father's station; it is, therefore, written: "and who shall be invested" [lit., "and who shall fill his hand"] — if he can fill his father's station, he takes precedence; if not, let another come and serve in his stead (Torath Cohanim). 141

16:33 And he shall make atonement for the sanctity of the holy place. And for the tent of meeting and for the altar shall he make atonement. And for the priests and for the entire people of the congregation shall he make atonement.

And he shall make atonement, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "And he shall make atonement for the sanctity of the holy place" — this is the holy of holies; "the tent of meeting" — this is the sanctuary; "the altar" — as the term implies; "shall he make atonement" — this refers to the azaroth [the Temple courts]; "the priests" — as the term implies; "the people of the congregation" — these are the Israelites; "shall he make atonement" — these are the Levites. They are all subsumed in one atonement; this teaches us that they are all atoned for by the sent-off hegoat [over which the high-priest confesses] (Yoma 61a). 142-144

the sanctity of the holy place - It was taught: I might think that in the second Temple, where there was no ark and ark-cover, the sprinkling would not be performed; it is, therefore, written: "And he shall make atonement for the sanctity of the holy place" — the place that is designated as holy [i.e., he sprinkles upon the place of the ark] (Menachoth 27b).¹⁴⁵

16:34 And this shall be to you for an everlasting statute to atone for the children of Israel from all of their sins once in the year. And he did as the L-rd commanded Moses.

for an everlasting statute - The two he-goats of Yom Kippur are categorical requirements. The seven sprinklings between the bars [projecting from the ark] and those upon the golden altar and on the curtain are categorical requirements. Whence is this derived? From: "statute" (*Ibid.* a). 146

to atone once in the year - The Rabbis taught: The entire order of the Yom Kippur service — if he performed one part [out of order] before the other, the entire service is invalidated. R. Yehudah said: To what does this apply? To those things that are done in the white garments, within; but those things that are done in the white garments outside [the holy of holies], if he performed one part before the other, what he did is

done [i.e., it is valid]. Why so? It is written: "this" and it is written: "once"; one to exclude [from the categorical requirement of order what is performed in] white garments on the outside, and one to exclude [what is performed in] golden garments (Yoma 60a). 147,148

- 17:1 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying:
- 17:2 Speak to Aaron and to his sons and to all the children of Israel, and say to them: This is the thing that the L-rd has commanded, saying:

Speak to Aaron and to his sons - What is the intent of this? [Why single them out if the *mitzvah* applies to all of the Jews?] I might think that Aaron and his sons, since they are not liable for entering within are also not liable for slaughtering outside [the Temple court]; it is, therefore, written: "to Aaron and to his sons" (Torath Cohanim).1

and to all the children of Israel - This teaches us that the children of Israel are commanded not to slaughter outside [the Temple court], but gentiles [who wish to bring an offering to the L-rd] are not so commanded (Zevachim 116b).²

and say to them - to include strangers and servants (Torath Cohanim).3

This is the thing - It was taught: It is written here: "This is the thing," and, in respect to vows (30:2): "This is the thing." Just as there, the heads of the tribes [were addressed], here, to, the heads of the tribes. What are the implications [of this comparison between offerings and vows] for the halachah? R. Shesheth said: It extends the application of sheilah [asking a sage to absolve one of one's vow] to offerings (Nedarim 78a).

17:3 A man, a man, from the house of Israel who slaughters an ox, or a lamb, or a goat in the camp, or who slaughters outside the camp,

A man, a man - Scripture speaks in the language of man (Zevachim 108b).⁵

who slaughters - He is liable for slaughtering, but not for melikah ["pinching" a bird's neck] (Ibid. 107a).6

outside the camp - I might think that "outside the three camps" is intended; it is, therefore, written: "in the camp" [i.e., in the camp of the Levites or the Israelites, outside the camp of the Shechinah]. If: "in the camp," I might think that one who slaughtered a burnt-offering in the south [of the camp of the Shechinah (instead of the north as prescribed)] would be liable [for slaughtering on the outside]; it is, therefore, written: "outside the camp." "Outside the camp" is distinguished by its being out of bounds for the slaughtering of sanctified offerings or of any sacrifice, as opposed to the south [of the azarah], which, though it is out of bounds for the slaughtering of higher-order offerings, is within bounds for lower-order offerings [Therefore, if one slaughters any offerings in the south of the azarah, he is not slaughtering on the outside] (Ibid. b).7

outside the camp - to include an instance in which all of it is inside, but its neck outside, or all of it outside but its neck inside as making him liable [for slaughtering on the outside] (*Ibid.*).8

17:4 And to the door of the tent of meeting he did not bring it to slaughter as an offering to the L-rd before the sanctuary of the L-rd, blood shall it be reckoned to that man; he has spilled blood, and that man will be cut off from the midst of his people.

And to the door of the tent of meeting. This teaches us that all that are not appropriate for "the door of the tent of meeting" [such as sin-offerings for cleansing women who have given birth, and the like, who have not yet completed the count of their unclean days] do not make one liable for slaughtering on the outside. I might think that I also exclude [from the outside-slaughtering interdict] burnt-offerings of those who have not completed the count [of their unclean days], and the guilt-offering of a Nazirite and a leper; it is, therefore, written (3): "an ox, or a lamb, or a goat": "an ox"—in any event; "a lamb"—in any event; "a goat"—in any event (Ibid. 115a).9

the door of the tent of meeting - to exclude [from outside-slaughtering violation, one who slaughtered on] its roof (*Ibid.* 107b).¹⁰

an offering to the L-rd - One who slaughters an offering outside incurs the penalty of *kareth*, but one who slaughters non-sanctified food in the *azarah* [though it is forbidden] does not incur the penalty of *kareth* (*Kiddushin* 57b).¹¹

an offering to the L-rd - If: "offering," I might think that what is sanctified for Temple maintenance is also included [in the interdict of outside-slaughtering], such, too, being referred to as "offering"; it is, therefore, written: "And to the door of the tent of meeting he did not bring it" — what is appropriate for [sacrifice in] the tent of meeting; to exclude maintenance offerings, which are not thus appropriate. I might think that the he-goat for sending, for which it is appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting [where the high-priest makes confession over it] does make one liable for outside-slaughtering; it is, therefore, written: "an offering to the L-rd" — what is designated as the L-rd's; to exclude the he-goat for sending, which is not so designated (Zevachim 113b). 12,13

before the sanctuary of the L-rd - An animal that sodomized a man or one that was sodomized, an animal devoted to idolatry, one that was an object of idol-worship, an exchange [for an animal inappropriate for an offering], the hire [of a harlot], an admixture, a treifah, and one of Caesarian birth — all such animals, if one offered them up outside, he is exempt; for it is written: "before the sanctuary of the L-rd" — All that are not appropriate for coming before the sanctuary of the L-rd do not make one liable (Ibid. 112a).14

blood shall it be reckoned - to include the slaughtering of a bird (*Ibid*. 107a). 15

blood shall it be reckoned to that man - even if one slaughters for a man [i.e., for eating, and not for offering] (*Ibid.* 108b). 16

to that man - he and not his sender. Why so? There is no messenger for a transgression (Kiddushin 43a).¹⁷

to that man - to exclude, for exemption, two that hold the knife and slaughter (Zevachim 108a). 18

and that man will be cut off - the man, and not the congregation, there being no cutting-off for the congregation (*Torath Cohanim*). 19

that man - he, and not one who is constrained; he, and not one who is unwitting; he, and not one who is mistaken (Zevachim 108b).²⁰

from the midst of his people - from the midst of his people — but his people remain at peace (*Torath Cohanim*).²¹

17:5 So that the children of Israel bring their sacrifices which they sacrifice in the open field, and bring them to the L-rd to the door of the tent of meeting to the priest and sacrifice them as peace-offerings to the L-rd.

and bring them to the L-rd - so that all of it be inside [the azarah] (Zevachim 26a).²²

and bring them to the L-rd - This is a positive commandment (*Ibid*. 106b).²³

and bring them to the L-rd - If the animal were non-sanctified and its fœtus [designated as] a peace-offering, and it were slaughtered outside, there is no outside-slaughtering violation. Why so? For it does not satisfy: "and bring them to the L-rd" [the fœtus not being in a state where it could be brought to the L-rd] (Temurah 12a).²⁴

17:6 And the priest shall sprinkle the blood on the altar of the L-rd at the door of the tent of meeting, and he shall cause the fat to smoke, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

And the priest shall sprinkle, etc. - There is no priest and there is no sprinkling of blood around the altar on a bamah [a temporary sacrificial mound], as it is written: "And the priest shall sprinkle the blood on the altar of the L-rd at the door of the tent of meeting" [and not upon a bamah] (Zevachim 119b).²⁵

And he shall cause the fat to smoke, etc. - It was taught: R. Yehoshua says: the blood of all offerings of which there remained an olive-size of flesh or of fat is sprinkled. Whence is this derived? From: "And he shall

cause the fat to smoke" — "fat," though there be no flesh. Whence is the same rule derived for the lobe of the liver and the two kidneys [i.e., if only they remain]? From: "a sweet savor" — anything which is offered up for a sweet savor (Pesachim 79b).^{26,27}

17:7 And they shall sacrifice no more their sacrifices to the satyrs, after which they go astray. An everlasting statute shall this be to them throughout their generations.

And they shall sacrifice no more - Until now Scripture has been speaking of offerings which were devoted [as sacrifices] at a time when bamoth were forbidden and offered up at a time when bamoth were forbidden. From this point onwards it speaks of offerings which were devoted when bamoth were permitted and offered up when bamoth were forbidden, as it is written (5): "which they sacrifice in the open field." — sacrifices which were permitted to you in the open field. And we are hereby taught that if one sacrifices on a bamah when such sacrifice is forbidden, it is as if he sacrifices in the open field (Zevachim 106b).²⁸

And they shall sacrifice no more - It was taught: R. Eliezer said: Whence is it derived that if one sacrifices an animal to Mercurius [an idol whose conventional mode of worship is not animal sacrifice] he is liable [for idol-worship]? From: "And they shall sacrifice no more their sacrifices to the satyrs." If this is not needed to proscribe the conventional mode of worship, it already being written (*Deuteronomy* 12:30): "How did these nations serve their gods ...", understand it as proscribing the unconventional mode (*Ibid.*).²⁹

shall this be to them - It was taught: I might think that if he dedicated it at a time when bamah-sacrifice was permitted and offered it up outside at a time when it was forbidden, he would incur the penalty of kareth; it is, therefore, written: "shall this be to them" — this [i.e., outside offering after dedication at a time when such offering was forbidden] is to them [a kareth offense], but another [that cited above] is not to them [a kareth offense] (Zevachim 106b). 30

17:8 And to them shall you say: A man, a man, from the house of Israel, and from the strangers that shall dwell in their

midst, who shall offer up a burnt-offering or a sacrifice,

And to them shall you say - This tells me only of the liability of one who offered up on the outside what had been [designated for] smoking on the inside [i.e., what had been slaughtered on the inside and so was appropriate for smoking on the inside]. Whence do I derive such liability for one who offered up on the outside what had been [designated for] smoking on the outside [i.e., what had been slaughtered on the outside]? From: "And to them [who had just been exhorted against slaughtering on the outside] shall you say" — a comingling of sections [what precedes and what follows] is indicated (*Ibid.* 107a).^{31,32}

A man, a man - to include [for liability] two who held a limb and offered it up (*Ibid.*).³³

who shall offer up a burnt-offering - Just as offering up is a distinct service, so all that are a distinct service [impose liability]; and just as a burnt-offering is appropriate for offering up [inside], so, all that are appropriate for offering up [inside impose liability] (*Ibid.* 115b).³⁴

or a sacrifice - to include one who sprinkles [the blood outside the tent of meeting as incurring liability] (*Ibid.* 107b).³⁵

or a sacrifice - to include [for liability] outside-offering of: the devoted portions of a guilt-offering, of a sin-offering, of higher-order offerings, and of lower-order offerings (*Ibid.* 109a). ³⁶

17:9 And not bring it to the door of the tent of meeting to offer it up to the L-rd, then that man shall be cut off from his people.

And not bring it to the door of the tent of meeting - to include all that comes to the door of the tent of meeting [i.e., not only animal offerings, but also meal-offerings, and the like] as imposing outside-offering liability. This tells me only of offerings which are fit [to be offered up ab initio]. Whence do I derive the same ruling for offerings which are not fit [ab initio, but are not taken down from the altar once they have been brought up]? From: "And not bring it to the door of the tent of meeting

to offer it up" — Anything which is accepted at the door of the tent of meeting imposes outside-offering liability (*Ibid.* 109a).³⁷

And not bring it - [What is the intent of this ("it," instead of "them")? To impose liability for a burnt-offering by itself and for a sacrifice itself (i.e., they need not both be slaughtered on the outside for liability to be incurred)] (Ibid. 107a).³⁸

to offer it up - only that [i.e., a limb] which is complete imposes outside-offering liability, and not that which is lacking [the minimum olive-size] (*Ibid.*).³⁹

to offer it up to the L-rd - "to the L-rd," and not for a profane purpose [i.e., not for idolatry, in which instance he incurs liability for idolworship, but not for outside-offering] (*Ibid.* 108a).⁴⁰

17:10 And a man, a man, from the house of Israel and from the stranger that sojourns among them, that shall eat any blood — I shall set My face against the soul that eats the blood, and I shall cut it off from the midst of its people.

I shall set my face - What is the intent of: "I shall set my face"? I shall free Myself from all My other affairs and deal with him alone (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴¹

17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to atone for your souls. For it is the blood which atones for the soul.

and I have given it to you, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the blood of offerings is not subject to profanation? Ulla said: From: "and I have given it to you" — it shall be yours [and not the L-rd's]. The school of R. Yishmael taught: "and I have given it to you... to atone" — I have given it for atonement and not for profanation. And R. Yochanan said: "for it is the blood" — "it" [is the same] before atonement as after atonement. Just as after atonement it is not subject to profanation, so before atonement it is not subject to profanation. And why are all three verses necessary? One to exclude it from [the

interdict against] *nothar* [left-over offerings]; one to exclude it from profanation; and one to exclude it from uncleanliness [i.e., if one ate it in a state of uncleanliness he incurs liability for eating blood, but not for defilement] (*Yoma* 59b).^{42,43}

upon the altar to atone - "upon the altar" — Once the blood reaches the altar [even if it is not sprinkled on the specified areas] the donors receive atonement; "to atone" — I have given it for atonement and for nothing else [i.e., if it is not sprinkled on the specified areas, though atonement is granted, the devoted portions may not be offered up and the flesh may not be eaten] (Zevachim 26b).44

for the blood, etc. - "For it is the blood which atones for the soul" — this teaches us that there is no atonement except through the blood (Yoma 5a).45

which atones for the soul [lit., "in the soul atones"] - This teaches us that the blood through which the soul leaves [i.e., expires,] atones, and not the other blood (Krituth 22b). 46

17:12 Therefore, I have said to the children of Israel: All souls of you shall not eat blood; and the stranger that sojourns in your midst shall not eat blood.

All souls of you - What is the intent of this? To exhort the elders over the children (Yevamoth 114a).⁴⁷

shall not eat blood - From here it is derived that drinking is subsumed in eating (Yerushalmi Yoma 8:3).⁴⁸

17:13 And a man, a man, from the children of Israel and from the stranger that sojourns in their midst, that shall hunt a hunting of animal or bird that may be eaten — he shall pour out its blood and cover it with earth.

And a man, a man - What is the intent of: "a man, a man"? Since it is written: "that shall hunt," I might think that the rule applies only to hunting. Whence do I derive that it also applies [to an animal] that is

purchased, inherited, or received as a gift? From: "And a man, a man" (Torath Cohanim). 49

that shall hunt a hunting - This tells me only of hunting. Whence do I derive the same rule for those which are already "hunted" and standing, such as geese and chickens? From: "a hunting" — in any event. If so, why say: "that shall hunt"? The Torah is hereby teaching proper conduct, viz., one should not eat flesh except if it is obtained thus adventitiously (Chullin 84a). 50,51

of animal or bird - The *mitzvah* of covering the blood applies to non-sanctified animals, but not to offerings. Whence is this derived? Mar b. R. Ashi said: From: "of animal or bird" — just as animals cannot be used for offerings [as opposed to "beasts"], so, the birds [in this context] are not offerings (*Ibid*.).⁵²

of animal or bird - "or" — to distinguish [i.e., the mitzvah of covering the blood does not demand the presence of both] (*Ibid.* 86b).⁵³

of animal or bird - The Rabbis taught: "animal" is generic — whether many or few; "bird" is generic — whether many or few. From here they derived that if one slaughtered one hundred animals or one hundred birds in one spot, one covering suffices for all; if he slaughtered animals and birds in one spot, one covering suffices for all (*Ibid.*).54,55

that may be eaten - One who slaughters an animal and finds it to be a treifah; one who slaughters an animal for idol-worship; one who slaughters non-sanctified animals inside [the azarah] and sanctified animals outside; one who slaughters birds or animals that were to be stoned; one in whose hands an animal became neveilah as he was about to slaughter it; one who stabs or rips [instead of slaughtering] — one who does any of these is exempt from covering the blood. Why so? For it is written: "that may be eaten" (Ibid. 85a). 36

he shall pour out its blood and cover it - that which lacks only pouring out and covering — to exclude altar offerings, which lack pouring out, dragging [from the altar] and covering; and to exclude Temple maintenance offerings, which lack pouring out, redemption, and covering, as exempt from the covering of the blood (*Ibid.* 84a).⁵⁷

he shall pour out its blood and cover it - With what he slaughtered [i.e.,

his hand] shall he cover; he shall not cover with his foot, so that the *mitzvoth* not be demeaned in his eyes (*Ibid.* 87a).⁵⁸

he shall pour out its blood and cover it - The Rabbis taught: "and he shall pour out its blood and cover it" — he who pours it out shall cover it. If he slaughtered and did not cover the blood, and another saw it, whence is it derived that he must cover it? From (14): "and I said to the children of Israel" — this is an exhortation to all of Israel (*Ibid.*). 59,60

and cover it - If he covered it and it became uncovered, he need not cover it again. R. Acha b. Rava queried: How is this different from the *mitzvah* of returning a lost object, concerning which the master said (*Deuteronomy* 22:1): "Return it" — even a hundred times [if necessary]? He was answered: There, [in repect to a lost object,] there is no limiting phrase; here, there is: "and cover it" (*Ibid.*).61

and cover it - The Rabbis taught: This teaches us that the blood which splashes forth at slaughtering and that upon the blade must be covered. R. Yehudah said: When is this so? When there is no blood beside that; but if there is, he need not cover it (*Ibid.* 88a).⁶²

and cover it with earth - R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Yishmael: The halachah "circumvents" Scripture. The Torah states: "and cover it with earth," and the halachah is that it may be covered with all matter [which causes things to sprout] (Sotah 16a).⁶³

and cover it with earth - It is not written: "earth," but "with earth"; this teaches us that earth must be placed below and above (Chullin 83b).64

and cover it with earth - The Rabbis taught: I might think that he could cover it with stones or place a vessel upon it; it is, therefore, written: "with earth" (*Ibid.* 88b).65

and cover it with earth - This tells me only of earth. Whence do I derive that I can cover it with thin fertilizer and thin sand and crushed stone and crushed earthenware and thin scraps of flax and thin woodshavings and lime and clay-ground, and ground bricks and sealing clay? From: "and cover it." I might think that I could also cover it with thick fertilizer and thick sand and the shavings of all metals, and unground bricks and sealing clay, and flour and bran-flour and coarse

bran; it is, therefore, written: "with earth" [which causes things to sprout] (*Ibid.*).66,67

and cover it with earth - It was taught: Beth Hillel say: We find that ashes are called "earth," as it is written (*Numbers* 19:17): "And they shall take for the unclean one from the earth of the burning of the sin-offering" (*Ibid.*).⁶⁸

with earth - Since "with earth" ["be'afar"] is written with a segolate beth [lit., "with the earth"] and not a shwa, this teaches us that it is necessary to prepare earth for covering (Perishah Ulevush, Yoreh Deah 28).69

17:14 For the soul of all flesh, its blood is in its soul. And I said to the children of Israel: The blood of all flesh you shall not eat. For the soul of all flesh is its blood; all who eat it shall be cut off.

And I said to the children of Israel - See commentary on (13): "he shall pour out its blood and cover it"

17:15 And every soul that shall eat *neveilah* [what dies of itself] and *treifah* [what is organically unfit], whether citizen or stranger, he shall wash his clothes and bathe in water, and he shall be unclean until the evening; then he shall be clean.

And every soul - "soul" — to include one who drinks [diluted neveilah] (Chullin 120a).70

And every soul - "in the house of the soul" [i.e., when it is swallowed and gives the soul pleasure] it causes uncleanliness; but it does not cause uncleanliness inside the mouth (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷¹

that shall eat - It causes uncleanliness only by way of eating and not by way of leaving [i.e., regurgitation] (*Ibid.*).⁷²

neveilah and treifah - The Rabbis taught: I might think that

"pinching" [the slaughtering of birds] which is performed within [the azarah] renders clothing unclean in the esophagus [i.e., when the flesh of the bird passes through the esophagus]; it is, therefore, written: "treifah" — just as treifah does not render permissible what was previously forbidden, so, all that does not render permissible what was previously forbidden; to exclude the pinching [of birds] performed within, which, since it renders permissible [for sacrifice] what was previously forbidden, does not render clothing unclean in the esophagus (Zevachim 69a). 73,74

and he shall be unclean until the evening - This teaches us that it does not render clothing unclean in the intestines [for he may have eaten it immediately before the evening, notwithstanding which, after bathing, he is clean in the evening] (Torath Cohanim).⁷⁵

17:16 But if he does not wash [his clothing] nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his sin.

then he shall bear his sin - I might think that for failure to wash his clothes he incurs the punishment of *kareth*; it is, therefore, written: "nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his sin" — For failure to bathe himself the punishment is *kareth*, but for failure to wash his clothes it is forty lashes (*Ibid.*).⁷⁶

- 18:1 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying:
- 18:2 Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: I am the L-rd your G-d.

I am the L-rd - I am He who exacted payment from the generation of the flood, and from the people of Sodom, and from the Egyptians; and I am destined to exact payment from you if you follow their ways (*Ibid.*).¹

18:3 As the deeds of the land of Egypt in which you dwelt you shall not do; and as the deeds of the land of Canaan to

which I bring you, you shall not do, and in their statutes you shall not walk.

As the deeds of the land of Egypt, etc. - If: "as the deeds," I might think that they should not build houses or plant things, as they do; it is, therefore, written: "and in their statutes you shall not walk" — I have proscribed to you only those statutes which were instituted for them and for their forefathers and for the fathers of their forefathers (*Ibid.*).²

and in their statutes you shall not walk - but what is written in the Torah [though they may have a similar statute] we do not learn from them! (Sanhedrin 52b).

and in their statutes you shall not walk - It was taught: One who wishes to clean his courtyard [from the blood of slaughtering] may make a place [a channel] outside the basin [into which the blood collects] and slaughter in such a way that the blood runs into the basin [but he should not slaughter into the basin itself, this being an idolatrous practice]. And in the market place [where he might cast suspicion upon himself] he should not do so, it being written: "and in their statutes you shall not walk" (Chullin 41b).^{4,5}

18:4 My judgments you shall do, and My statutes you shall heed to walk in them; I am the L-rd your G-d.

My judgments you shall do, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "My judgments you shall do, and My statutes you shall heed." Which are judgments and which are statutes? "Judgments" — such things, which, even if they had not been written would "ask" to be written, viz., [the interdiction of] idolatry, illicit relations, and the spilling of blood. "Statutes" — such things which [because their purpose is not apparent] the Satan "queries," viz., [the interdictions against] the eating of pig and the wearing of sha'atnez [a mixture of wool and linen], chalitzah [the levirate-refusal ceremony], the cleansing of the leper, the sent-away he-goat. And lest you say that they are utterly void of reason — "I am the L-rd"; I, the L-rd, decreed them, and it is not for you to call them into question (Yoma 67b).6

My judgments, etc. - It was taught: "My judgments you shall do, and

My statutes you shall heed to walk in them": "My judgments" — these are the laws; "My statutes" — these are the *midrashoth* [exegetical derivations]; "you shall heed" — this is the *Mishnah*; "to walk in them" — this is the deed (*Torath Cohanim*).

18:5 And you shall heed My statutes and My judgments, which a man shall do, and he shall live in them; I am the L-rd.

And you shall heed My statutes, etc. - What is the intent of this? [It sounds repetitious after the preceding verse.] To ascribe heeding and doing to statutes and heeding and doing to judgments (*Ibid.*).⁸

which a man shall do - It was taught: R. Meir was wont to say: Whence is it derived that even a gentile who occupies himself with Torah is like the high-priest? From: "which a man shall do." It is not written: "priests, Levites, or Israelites," but: "a man." This teaches us that even a gentile who occupies himself with Torah is like the high-priest (Bava Kamma 38a).

which a man shall do, and he shall live in them - [followed by (6): "A man, a man, to all the kin of his flesh shall not draw near"] This teaches us that one who sits [i.e., one who is passive] and does not transgress receives reward as if he had [actively] done a mitzvah (Makkoth 23b). 10

and he shall live in them - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the preservation of life overrides the Sabbath? R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: From: "And you shall heed My statutes and My judgments, which a man shall do, and he shall live in them" — and not die through them (Yoma 85b).

and he shall live in them - It was taught: R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Shimon b. Yehotzadak: It was put to a count and confirmed in the upper chamber of the house of Nitzah in Lod: In respect to all the transgressions in the Torah, except idolatry, illicit relations, and the spilling of blood, if one is told: Transgress or you will be killed, he is to transgress and not be killed. [Why so? "and he shall live in them" — and not die through them] (Sanhedrin 74a). 12

and he shall live in them - Rava said (Exodus 20:5): "You shall not bow down to them, and you shall not serve them" — All types of worship

[voluntary and involuntary] were herein subsumed; and when the Torah specified: "and he shall live in them," but not die through them, involuntary worship [on pain of death] was excluded [from the command not to bow down, etc.]. But then it was written (*Leviticus* 22:32): "and do not desecrate My holy Name" — even involuntarily! How is this to be understood? Here, in private; here, in public [i.e., in private, he does not incur the death penalty for not sanctifying the Name by giving his life; in public (i.e., where there are ten Jews looking on), he does incur the death penalty] (*Avodah Zarah* 54a).¹³

and he shall live in them - R. Levi said: It is written: "And you shall heed My statutes and My judgments, which a man shall do, and he shall live in them" — and the light of a man's eyes does not fully return until forty days [after a fast, for which reason it was not ordained that one fast in the night of the seventeeth of Tammuz as well as in the day] (Yerushalmi Ta'anith 4:5).14

18:6 A man, a man, to all the kin of his flesh shall not draw near to reveal nakedness; I am the L-rd.

A man, a man - The Rabbis taught: "man" — Why: "A man, a man"? To include gentiles, who are commanded in respect to illicit relations, as Jews are (Sanhedrin 57b).¹⁵

the kin of his flesh - See commentary on (10).

shall not draw near - What is the intent of this [i.e., of the plural: "you shall not draw near"]? Since it is written: "A man," I might think that only a man is exhorted [in respect to illicit relations]. Whence do I derive that a woman is similarly exhorted? From: "you [plural] shall not draw near" (Torath Cohanim). 16,17

shall not draw near - From here the sages derived: Let a man not be alone with women in an inn — even with his sister and with his daughter. And let him not walk and talk with a woman in the market-place — even with his wife — because of what people might say (Avoth d'R. Nathan 2).^{18,19}

shall not draw near to reveal - It was taught: This tells me only that

they should not "reveal" [i.e., cohabit]. Whence do I derive that they should not come close to it? From: "shall not draw near" (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁰

18:7 The nakedness of your father and the nakedness of your mother you shall not reveal. She is your mother; do not reveal her nakedness.

The nakedness of your father - "the nakedness of your father" [i.e., sodomy]. But do we not derive [the interdiction against] this from (22): "And do not lie with a male"? The intent is to make him liable for two offenses [sodomy and lying with his father] (Sanhedrin 54a). 21,22

She is your mother - to include his mother who is not the wife of his father. [And who is that? One who was forced or "persuaded" by his father] (*Ibid.*).²³

18:8 The nakedness of the wife of your father you shall not reveal; it is your father's nakedness.

The nakedness of the wife of your father - This is an exhortation against lying with his father's wife (*Ibid.*).²⁴

it is your father's nakedness - This is an exhortation against lying with his father's wife after his father's death (*Ibid.*).²⁵

18:9 The nakedness of your sister, the daughter of your father or the daughter of your mother, born of the home or born of the outside, you shall not reveal their nakedness.

born of the home, etc. - What is meant by: "born of the outside"? Whether born of one concerning whom we tell your father: "Keep her" [in the home, i.e., one that he was permitted to marry], or born of one concerning whom we tell your father: "Send her out" [i.e., one that he was not permitted to marry] (Yevamoth 23a).²⁶

18:10 The nakedness of the daughter of your son or the

daughter of your daughter, you shall not reveal their nakedness; for they are your nakedness.

The nakedness of the daughter of your son - The implication is that the daughter of her son and the daughter of her daughter are permitted. But is it not written (17): "The nakedness of a woman and her daughter you shall not reveal; the daughter of her son and the daughter of her daughter you shall not take"? How is this to be understood? This instance [the first, where it is permitted,] refers to [the offspring, by another, of] a woman that he has forced; the other instance [the second, where it is forbidden,] refers to [the offspring, by another, of] a woman that he has married. But perhaps the opposite is the case! [This cannot be, for] in respect to illicit relations, "kin" is written (6) [i.e., they are forbidden only among kin], and in the case of forcing, the "kin" factor is absent (Ibid. 97a).²⁷

or the daughter of your daughter - Your own daughter [by a woman that you have forced] is thus forbidden, a fortiori. But are punishments legislated by a fortiori arguments! [i.e., this is a contravention of the principles of exegesis] [There is no such contravention here; her being forbidden is] simply an illumination of the situation itself [i.e., if her child is forbidden, naturally, she herself must be forbidden] (Sanhedrin 76a).²⁸

18:11 The nakedness of the daughter of your father's wife, begotten of your father, she is your sister; you shall not reveal her nakedness.

The nakedness of the daughter of your father's wife - The Rabbis taught: One who lives with his sister who is the daughter of his father's wife is liable on two counts. Why so? Let us see. It is written (9): "The nakedness of your sister, the daughter of your father or the daughter of your mother." Why, then, write again [here]: "The nakedness of the daughter of your father's wife"? It must be to make him liable on two counts: living with his sister, and living with the daughter of his father's wife (Yevamoth 22b).²⁹

the daughter of your father's wife - to exclude one's sister by a maid-

servant or by a gentile woman, your father having no relationship of marriage with them (*Ibid.*).³⁰

she is your sister - What are we taught by this? If he is exhorted against the daughter of his mother who is not the daughter of his father and against the daughter of his father who is not the daughter of his mother, is it not obvious that he is exhorted against the daughter of his father and of his mother? This teaches us that exhortations are not derived from a fortiori arguments (Makkoth 5b).³¹

18:12 The nakedness of the sister of your father you shall not reveal; she is the kin of your father.

The nakedness of the sister of your father - whether by his father or by his mother (Yevamoth 54b).³²

- 18:13 The nakedness of the sister of your mother you shall not reveal; for she is the kin of your mother.
- 18:14 The nakedness of the brother of your father you shall not reveal. To his wife do not come near; she is your uncle.

she is your uncle - R. Huna said in the name of Rav: Whence is it derived that a woman is as her husband? From: "The nakedness of the brother of your father you shall not reveal. To his wife do not come near; she is your uncle." Now is she his uncle? Is she not the wife of his uncle? We see, then, that a woman is as her husband. From here we derive that a man does not testify against the wife of his step-son (Sanhedrin 28b).³³

18:15 The nakedness of your daughter-in-law you shall not reveal. She is the wife of your son; you shall not reveal her nakedness.

The nakedness of your daughter-in-law - "your daughter-in-law," and

not the daughter-in-law of your son [which is not a Scriptural, but a Rabbinical prohibition] (Yevamoth 21b).³⁴

18:16 The nakedness of the wife of your brother you shall not reveal; she is the nakedness of your brother.

The nakedness of the wife of your brother - whether by your father or by your mother (*Ibid.* 55a).³⁵

The nakedness of the wife of your brother - It was taught: "The nakedness of the wife of your brother" and (*Deuteronomy* 25:5): "Her husband's brother shall come upn her" [levirate marriage] were stated in one pronouncement" [to obviate a sense of contradiction] (*Yerushalmi Nedarim* 3:2).³⁶

she is the nakedness of your brother - "she is" — she is to remain in her [forbidden] state. This teaches us that the wife of one's maternal brother [to whom levirate marriage does not apply] is forbidden to him even after the death of her husband (Yevamoth 55a).³⁷

18:17 The nakedness of a woman and her daughter you shall not reveal. The daughter of her son and the daughter of her daughter you shall not take to reveal her nakedness. They are kin; it is scheming.

The daughter of her son, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the anterior [generations] are [forbidden] as the succeeding ones? It is written here [in respect to the exhortation]: "it is scheming," and later (*Ibid.* 20:14) [in respect to the punishment]: "it is scheming" — just as there, the anterior generations [i.e., mother-in-law, mother of mother-in-law, etc.] are as the succeeding ones [daughter of daughter's son, etc.], here, too, the anterior generations are as the succeeding ones (*Sanhedrin* 75a). 38,39

it is scheming - [If one was married to three wives, and he lived with the mother of one of them, who was also the mother of the mother of the second, and the mother of the father of the third, he is liable on only one

count] Why so? For it is written: "They are kin; it is scheming" — Scripture made all of them one scheming (Krituth 15a).40

18:18 And a woman together with her sister you shall not take, to be rivals, to reveal her nakedness upon her in her lifetime.

And a woman together with her sister - to exclude [from the prohibition, marrying a woman's sister] after the death [of the first] (Yevamoth 8b).⁴¹

And a woman together with her sister - If one betroths a man and her daughter or a woman and her sister at the same time, they are not betrothed, for it is written: "And a woman together with her sister you shall not take, to be rivals"; and all that cannot be taken one after the other cannot be taken even at the same time (Kiddushin 50b).⁴²

you shall not take - The Rabbis taught: In all the other instances, the term "lying" is used, and, here, the term "taking" — to teach that all of these [that are forbidden because of one's wife] are forbidden only through "taking" [i.e., if he has married the first, and not if he has forced her] (Yevamoth 97a).⁴³

to be rivals...upon her - What is the intent of this? Because it is written (*Deuteronomy* 25:5): "Her husband's brother shall come upon her" [levirate marriage], I might think that this applied even to one of the Scriptural forbidden relations, it is, therefore, written here: "upon her," and, there: "upon her"; just as there, the context is one of *mitzvah* [levirate marriage], notwithstanding which, Scripture states: "you shall not take." This tells us only of [the prohibition against taking] her; whence do we derive [the same prohibition for] her "rival" [i.e., the brother's other wife] and the rival of her rival [as far down the line as the connection to the forbidden sister extends]? From: "to be rivals"—the Torah has hereby included many rivals (*Ibid.* 3b, 13a). 44-46

to be rivals ... upon her in her lifetime - "in her lifetime" — as long as she is alive; even if she is divorced (*Ibid.* 8b).⁴⁷

18:19 And to a woman in the *niddah* state of her uncleanliness, you shall not come near to reveal her nakedness.

And to a woman - to make one liable for each woman [i.e., if he inadvertently lives with several women, each representing a different illicit relationship, in one time period, he is liable (to bring a sin-offering) for each one] (Makkoth 14a).⁴⁸

you shall not come near - It was taught in the school of Eliyahu: It happened that a certain scholar died young, and his wife asked: "My husband, who studied so much Torah and Talmud — why did he die so young?" And I answered: "My daughter, how did he deport himself with you in the days of your whiteness [preceding your immersion for your niddah uncleanliness]?" She answered: "He ate with me, and drank with me, and slept with me in flesh-contact; but nothing untoward ever entered his mind." I, thereupon said to her: "Blessed is the Holy One, who killed him and did not leave the Torah unvindicated; for the Torah writes: 'And to a woman in the niddah state of her uncleanliness, you shall not come near'" (Shabbath 13b).⁴⁹

you shall not come near - It was taught: Where do we find Scripture making a "fence" for its words? It is written: "And to a woman in the niddah state of her uncleanliness, you shall not come near to reveal her uncleanliness." I might think that he is permitted to embrace her, to kiss her, to hold casual converse with her, and to sleep with her clothed; it is, therefore, written: "you shall not come near" (Avoth d'R. Nathan 2).50

you shall not come near to reveal - This is the Scriptural exhortation against living with a niddah (Shevuoth 18b).⁵¹

you shall not come near to reveal - [i.e.,] coming near, to the end of "revealing" (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 7:7). 52

18:20 And to the wife of your neighbor do not give your lying for seed to become unclean with her.

your lying for seed - to exclude coition with membrum mortuum (Yevamoth 55b).53

to become unclean with her - The thing [i.e., whether or not she is forbidden to her husband] depends upon her; if she consented, she is forbidden to him, and if she was forced, she is permitted (Yerushalmi Sotah 5:1).⁵⁴

18:21 And from your seed you shall not give to pass [through fire] to Moloch. And you shall not desecrate the name of your G-d; I am the L-rd.

And from your seed - If one interprets: "And from your seed you shall not give to pass to Moloch" as: "Do not impregnate an Aramite woman" [who will devote her children to such worship], he is to be silenced with a sharp rebuke (Megillah 26a).⁵⁵

And from your seed - This teaches us that he is liable only for [thus passing] his seed, but if he passes his father, his mother, sister, or himself, he is not liable (Sanhedrin 64b).⁵⁶

And from your seed - R. Acha, the brother of Rava, said: One who passes all of his seed is not liable, for it is written: "And from your seed," and not all your seed (*Ibid.*).57

you shall not give to pass - It was taught: I might think that if he passed, but did not give, or gave, but did not pass, he is liable; it is, therefore, written: "you shall not give to pass" (*Ibid.*).⁵⁸

you shall not give to pass - This teaches us that he is not liable until he passes him through in the usual manner; if he passes him through by his feet, he is not liable (*Ibid.*). 59

to pass to Moloch - But if he gave and passed, not to Moloch, he is not liable [this being the mode of worship only for Moloch] (*Ibid.*).60

to pass to Moloch - It was taught: If he gave and passed to Moloch, but not through fire, I might think that he is liable; I, therefore, deduce [otherwise]: It is written here: "to pass," and, elsewhere (*Deuteronomy* 18:10): "There shall not be found among you one who passes his son or his daughter through fire" — just as there, through fire; here, too, through fire (*Ibid.*).⁶¹

18:22 And with a male you shall not lie the lyings of a woman; it is an abomination.

And with a male you shall not lie - This is an exhortation against the active participant; whence do we derive an exhortation against the passive participant? R. Akiva said: From: "Lo tishkav" ["you shall not lie"], which can also be read: "Lo tishachev" ["you shall not be lain with"] (Ibid. 54b).62

And with a male you shall not lie - One who comes upon a male and brings a male upon himself, according to R. Akiva, is liable on only one count. [Why so? R. Akiva understands "Lo tishkav"-"Lo tishachev" as an exhortation against the active and the passive participant], and "Lo tishkav"-"Lo tishachev" are one (Ibid.).⁶³

the lyings of a woman - Which male is susceptible of two "lyings"? A hermaphrodite. When is there liability? In his male feature [i.e., the anus], and not in his female feature. Why so? For it is written: "And with a male." Whence do we derive liability for a male alone [i.e., not a hermaphrodite]? From: "a woman" [i.e., what is possible with a woman is forbidden with a male]. Whence do I derive [liability for] sodomy [and not only normal intercourse] with a woman [who is forbidden to him]? From: "And with a male" [connoting extension of liability] (Yevamoth 83b).64-66

the lyings of a woman - If one says to his wife [in divorcing her]: "You are permitted to all men except for non-normal intercourse [i.e., sodomy]," what is the halachah? Do we say that as far as normal intercourse is concerned he left no ties with her [and she is, therefore, divorced]; or do we say that it is written: "the lyings of a woman" [implying that non-normal intercourse is also included in the context of marital relationships, and she is, therefore, not divorced]. This question remained unresolved (Gittin 85a).⁶⁷

the lyings of a woman - [It is not written: "the lying of a woman," but "the lyings of a woman," implying that there are two types of lying with a woman [i.e., normal and non-normal (anal) intercourse] (Sanhedrin 54a).68

the lyings of a woman - It was taught: One who has a peripheral [i.e.,

non-consummated] relationship with a male is liable. Why so? It is written: "the lyings" of a woman [and such a relationship, too, is included in that context] (*Ibid.* 55a).⁶⁹

it is an abomination - R. Kappara asked Rebbi: What is "toevah"? ["abomination"] — "toeh atah vah" ["you are straying in it" (i.e., in homosexuality, you are straying from the paths of nature)] (Nedarim 51a).70

18:23 And with every beast do not give your lying to become unclean with it. And a woman shall not stand before a beast to mount her; it is perverse.

do not give your lying - This is an exhortation against [actively] lying with a beast. Whence do we derive an exhortation against passive participation? R. Akiva said: From: "Lo titen shechavtecha" ["do not give your lying,"], which can also be read as "Lo titen shechivatecha": ["do not give your being lain with"] (Sanhedrin 54b).71

do not give your lying - It was taught: One who comes upon a beast and brings a beast upon himself, according to R. Akiva, is liable on only one count. [Why so? R. Akiva understands "Lo titen shechavtecha"-"Lo titen shechivatecha" as an exhortation against the active and the passive participant], and "shechavtecha"-"shechivatecha" are one (Ibid.). 72

it is perverse - [Heb., "tevel hu"] Bar Kappara asked Rebbi: What is "tevel hu"? — There is tavlin ["an admixture" (of man and beast)] in it (Nedarim 51a).73

18:24 Do not become unclean with all of these. For with all of these the nations became unclean, which I am sending away before you.

Do not become unclean with all of these - [Now is one not to become unclean with all of these, but to become unclean with one of these? What, then, is the intent of "with all of these"?] With any one of all these (Sanhedrin 81a).⁷⁴

- 18:25 And the land became unclean, and I visited its sin upon it, and the land vomited out its inhabitants.
- 18:26 And you shall keep My statutes and My judgments; and you shall not do any of these abominations, the citizen and the stranger that sojourns among you.
- 18:27 For all of these abominations were done by the people of the land which were before you, and the land became unclean.

all of these abominations - R. Chama b. Chanina said: Every man of vain spirit is comparable to one who engaged in all of the forbidden relations, it being written in respect to the former (*Proverbs* 16:5): "The abomination of the L-rd are all who are haughty of heart," and, in respect to the latter: "For all of the abominations were done" (*Sotah* 4b).⁷⁵

these abominations - Rava said: Where are secondary categories of illicit relations [those forbidden by the Rabbis] intimated in the Torah? In: "For all of these abominations were done." "These" connotes [in the Hebrew] "the strong ones" [i.e., the severe, Torah-proscribed relations], the implication being that there are weaker ones. And which are these? The secondary categories (Yevamoth 21a).76

18:28 So that the land not vomit you out by your making it unclean, as it vomited out the nation that was before you.

So that the land not vomit you out - It was taught: Because of the sin of illicit relations exile comes to the world. They [the sinners] are exiled, and others come to dwell in their place, as it is written (27): "For all of these abominations were done, etc.," and (25): "And the land became unclean, and I visited its sin upon it," and: "So that the land not vomit you out by your making it unclean" (Shabbath 33a).⁷⁷

18:29 For all who do any of these abominations, the souls of the

doers shall be cut off from the midst of their people.

any of these abominations - R. Huna b. R. Yehoshua said: Whence do we derive the interdict against he'arah [non-consummated intercourse] in Scripture? From: "For all who do any of these abominations shall be cut off." All of the illicit relations are comparable to niddah. Just as with niddah, he'arah is interdicted, so with all of the illicit relations (Yevamoth 54b).⁷⁸

any of these abominations - R. Huna b. R. Yehoshua said: Whence is it derived that marriage does not take effect in the forbidden relations? From: "For all who do any of these abominations shall be cut off." All of the illicit relations are comparable to the sister of one's wife. Just as marriage does not take effect with the latter, so with all of the illicit relations (Kiddushin 67b).⁷⁹

the souls of the doers shall be cut off - What is the intent of: "the doers"? Because it is written (6): "you shall not come near," I might think that coming near carries the penalty of cutting-off; it is, therefore, written: "the souls of the *doers* shall be cut off" — doing [the act] carries with it the penalty of cutting-off, but not coming near to it (*Torath Cohanim*).80

18:30 And you shall keep My charge, not to do in the manner of the abominations that were done before you, and you shall not become unclean in them; I am the L-rd, your G-d.

And you shall keep My charge - It was taught: Where in Scripture is the marking of graves intimated? R. Ashi said: "And you shall keep My charge" — Make a "keeping" [i.e, protection,] for My charge, [in this case, to forewarn the priests against uncleanliness] (Moed Katan 5a).81

And you shall keep My charge - It was taught: Where are secondary categories of illicit relations intimated in the Torah? R. Cahana said: "And you shall keep My charge" — Make a "keeping" for My charge (Yevamoth 21a).82

And you shall keep My charge - to exhort beth-din [to be vigilant] in this regard (Torath Cohanim).⁸³

Kedoshim

- 19:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saving:
- 19:2 Speak to the entire congregation of the children of Israel, and say to them: Holy shall you be, for holy am I, the L-rd your G-d.

Speak to the entire congregation - This teaches us that this section was stated in the presence of all. And why so? For most of the major tenets of Torah are inherent in it (Torath Cohanim). 1,2

Holy shall you be, etc. - "Holy shall you be" — separate shall you be [from illicit relations]; "for holy am I" — If you sanctify yourselves, I shall consider it as if you had sanctified Me (*Ibid.*).³

19:3 A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear, and My Sabbaths you shall keep; I am the L-rd your G-d.

A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear - The Rabbis taught: "A man" — this tells me only of a man; whence do I derive [the same for] a woman? "You [plural] shall fear" connotes both. If so, why is it written: "A man"? A man is in a position of doing [things to honor his parents]. A woman is not in a position of doing, for she is subject to another's [her husband's] will (Kiddushin 30b).4

his mother and his father - R. Shimon says: The father takes precedence to the mother in all instances. I might think that this is so because the father's honor is above that of the mother; it is, therefore, written: "A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear," to teach that both are equal. But the sages have said: The father takes

precedence to the mother in all instances because both he and his mother are obliged to honor his father (Krituth 28a). 5,6

his mother and his father, you shall fear - The Rabbis taught: It is written: "A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear," and (*Deuteronomy* 6:13): "The L-rd your G-d you shall fear." From here it is derived that the Torah likens the fear of father and mother to the fear of the L-rd (*Kiddushin* 30b).

his mother and his father, you shall fear - It was taught: Rebbi says: It is manifestly revealed to Him who spoke and caused the world to come into being that a son fears his father more than his mother because he teaches him Torah; it is for this reason [to offset, as it were, the imbalance] that He placed fear of mother before fear of father (*Ibid.* 31a).8

you shall fear - The Rabbis taught: What is "fear"? Not to stand in his place, not to sit in his place, not to contradict his words, and not to override his words (*Ibid.*).9

and My Sabbaths you shall keep - It was taught: I might think that the honoring of father and mother countermanded the Sabbath; it is, therefore written: "A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear, and My Sabbaths you shall keep; I am the L-rd your G-d" — you are all obliged to honor Me (Yevamoth 8b). 10

and My Sabbaths you shall keep - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one's father told him: Become unclean [in the event of his being a priest] or: Do not return a lost object — Whence is it derived that the son is not to heed the father? From: "A man, his mother and his father, you shall fear, and My Sabbaths you shall keep" — you are all obligated to honor Me (Bava Metzia 32a). 11

19:4 Do not turn to the idols, and molten gods do not make for yourselves; I am the L-rd your G-d.

Do not turn, etc. - The Rabbis taught: One is not permitted to gaze at an image, it being written: "Do not turn to the idols." What does this signify? R. Chanan said: Do not turn to the creations of your imagination (Shabbath 149a).¹²

do not make for yourselves - It was taught: If: "do not make for yourselves," I might think that others are permitted to make it for them; it is, therefore, written: "not... for yourselves." If: "not... for yourselves," I might think that they may make it for others; it is, therefore, written: "Do not make" [for others] - "not... for yourselves" [if others make it for you] (Torath Cohanim).

19:5 And if you slaughter a sacrifice of peace-offerings to the L-rd, for your will shall you slaughter it.

for your will shall you slaughter it - What is the intent of: "for your will"? The Holy One Blessed be He said to Israel: You are not sacrificing by My desire, but by yours [to gain atonement] (Menachoth 110a).¹⁴

for your will shall you slaughter it - Shmuel asked R. Huna: Whence is it derived that adventitious [non-intentional] slaughtering of sacrifical animals is invalid? He answered: From (Leviticus 1:5): "And he shall slaughter the bullock" — the slaughtering must be directed towards the bullock. He asked further: Whence is categorical disqualification derived? He answered: From: "for your will shall you slaughter it" — it must be slaughtered with your knowledge (Chullin 13a). 15

shall you slaughter it - R. Yosef taught: "shall you slaughter it" — This teaches us that one shall not perform two slaughterings at one time (*Ibid.* 29a). 16

19:6 On the day that you slaughter it, it shall be eaten, and on the next day; and what remains until the third day shall be burned in fire.

On the day that you slaughter - This teaches us that the entire day is fit for slaughtering (Megillah 20b).¹⁷

and what remains until the third day - The Rabbis taught: I might think that it may be eaten on the eve of the third day; it is, therefore, written: "and what remains until the third day" — While it is still day, it may be eaten, but it may not be eaten on the eve of the third day (Zevachim 56b).¹⁸

19:7 And if it is eaten on the third day, it is rejected; it shall not be accepted.

And if it is eaten on the third day, etc. - What is the intent of this? Is it not already written (7:18): "And if there be eaten of the flesh of the sactifice of his peace-offerings on the third day, etc."? But if it is not needed to interdict eating outside the prescribed time, understand it as interdicting eating outside the prescribed place, and Scripture excluded it [from cutting-off], it being written (8): "And the eater of it [outside of the prescribed time] shall bear his sin [of cutting-off]" — to exclude [from cutting-off] eating outside the prescribed place [see commentary on 7:18] (Zevachim 28b).¹⁹

19:8 And the eater of it shall bear his sin, for he has profaned the holy thing of the L-rd; and that soul shall be cut off from its people.

And the eater of it shall bear his sin, etc. - [Is Scripture speaking of absolute nothar (what is eaten outside of the prescribed time) or of piggul (what is rejected because it is eaten) outside its prescribed place?] It is written here: "for he has profaned the holy thing of the L-rd," and, elsewhere (Exodus 29:34): "And you shall burn the nothar with fire... for it is holy"; just as "holy" there refers to "nothar," here, too, it refers to nothar (Krituth 5a).²⁰

for he has profaned the holy thing of the L-rd - The offerings of the gentiles are not subject to nothar liability. Why so? It is written in respect to nothar: "And the eater of it shall bear his sin, for he has profaned the holy thing of the L-rd"; and we derive: "profanation" - "profanation" from uncleanliness: just as the offerings of the gentiles are not subject to uncleanliness liability, so they are not subject to nothar liability (Temurah 3a).²¹

19:9 And when you cut the harvest of your land, do not end off the corner of your field to cut it; and the gleaning of your harvest, you shall not gather.

And when you cut - to include [in the mitzvah] partners in the field (Chullin 135b).²²

And when you cut - to exclude cutting by gentiles or by thieves, nibbling by ants, or breaking by wind or beast (*Torath Cohanim*).^{23,24}

And when you cut, etc. - This tells me only of cutting. Whence do I derive [application of the *mitzvah* to] ripping? From: "to cut it" [the repetition connoting extension of inclusion]. Whence do I derive uprooting? From: "your harvest" (Yerushalmi Peah 1:4).²⁵

the harvest - Just as "harvest connotes that which is edible, that which is owned, that which grows from the ground, that which is picked at one time, and that which is brought in to stay [i.e., that which does not rot quickly], so, all possessing the above characteristics are subject to peah liability [the obligation of leaving gleanings for the poor] (Torath Cohanim).²⁶

the harvest of your land - This tells me only of grain. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the *mitzvah*] beans? From: "the harvest of your land" [all that is in your land] (Yerushalmi Peah 1:4).²⁷

the harvest of your land - It was taught: "the harvest of your land," and not the harvest outside of your land (*Ibid.* 2:5).²⁸

do not end off - It was taught: R. Shimon said: For four reasons the Torah dictated not ending off the end of his field [as opposed to some other portion]: so that the poor not be cheated [by his favoring one of his own kinsmen before they are aware that he has left something over]; so that the time of the poor not be wasted [in waiting to see which portion he will leave over]; so that he not leave himself open to suspicion [of not having set aside peah]; and so that he not be in violation of: "do not end off." But are not all of these referable to "do not end off"? Rava answered: The last refers to the deceivers [who would otherwise be enabled to say: We have already set aside our portion] (Shabbath 23a).²⁹⁻³¹

the corner of your field - Whence is it derived that if one wishes to set aside his entire field as *peah* he may do so? From: "the corner of your *field*" (Nedarim 6b).³²

the corner of your field - to make one liable for all of his fields (Torath Cohanim).³³

your field - to exclude those fields whose ownership he has renounced [hefker] (Rashi on Bava Kamma 94a).³⁴

your field - to exclude partnership with a gentile [the portion of the gentile not being subject to peah] (Chullin 135b).³⁵

your field - [all that is in your field] to include trees (Yerushalmi Peah 1:4).36

your field - "your field" connotes any amount. From here R. Akiva derived: Any amount of land is subject to peah liability (Ibid. 3:7).³⁷

to cut it - Peah may be set aside from the beginning of the field and from the middle. R. Shimon said: So long as he also sets aside the required amount from the end. Whence does R. Shimon derive this? R. Yonah answered: "And when you cut"; why add: "to cut it"? One for the beginning [of the field] and one for the end (*Ibid.* 1:3).^{38,39}

and the gleaning of your harvest - the gleaning of your harvest, and not the gleaning of picking (Chullin 137a).⁴⁰

and the gleaning of your harvest - This teaches us that the gleaning is only that which comes from the act of harvesting [and not from a blow to his hand (so that he drops what he has already harvested)] (Torath Cohanim).⁴¹

19:10 And your vineyard you shall not glean; and the fallen fruit of your vineyard you shall not gather. To the poor man and to the stranger you shall leave them; I am the L-rd your G-d.

And your vineyard you shall not glean - What are gleanings? All tendrils which have no grapes bunched together or hanging down from the end (Peah 7:4).⁴²

And your vineyard you shall not glean - even if it is all gleanings. If so, why is it written (*Deuteronomy* 24:21): "When you harvest your

vineyard, you shall not glean"? To teach that the poor have no rights in it before the harvest (*Ibid.* 7).^{43,44}

and the fallen fruit of your vineyard - Which is the "fallen fruit"? That which falls at the time of harvesting (*Ibid.* 3).45

you shall not gather - What is the intent of: "you shall not gather"? You shall not gather it for the poor man (Gittin 12a).46

you shall not gather - [followed by: "To the poor man and to the stranger"] to exhort the poor man for his own [i.e., to oblige him in setting aside *peah* from his own field] (Chullin 131b).⁴⁷

To the poor man and to the stranger - "To the poor man and to the stranger," and not to ravens and bats [i.e., he must not leave them to be scavenged if there are no poor men or strangers to take them] (*Ibid.* 134b).⁴⁸

To the poor man and to the stranger - It was taught: Two berries constitute "fallen fruit"; three do not. Two stalks constitute "gleaning"; three do not. Whence is this derived? From: "To the poor man and to the stranger you shall leave them": "To the poor man" — one; "and to the stranger" — one (Yerushalmi Peah 6:1).49

you shall leave - It was taught: The owners have no donor's rights in *Peah* [i.e., they cannot give it to the poor man of their choice]. Why so? "Leaving" is written in that regard (*Chullin* 131b).⁵⁰

you shall leave - Why does Scripture state again (*Ibid.* 23:22): "you shall leave"? As it was taught: One who renounces ownership of his vineyard and the next morning arises and harvests it, is liable for fallen fruit, gleanings, forgotten grapes, and *peah* [the second "you shall leave" adding this liability], and he is exempt from the tithes (*Ibid.* 134b).⁵¹

you shall leave - And it is written further (*Ibid.* 23:22): "you shall leave" — to teach that if he did not leave over from the standing grain, he must leave over from the sheaves; if he did not leave over from the sheaves, he must leave over from the grain-store. In the name of R. Yishmael they said: He must also leave over from the dough (*Temurah* 6a).⁵²

you shall leave - It was taught: Whence is it derived that what is in a doubtful status of "gleaning," is [ruled] gleaning; in a doubtful status of "forgotten," forgotten; in a doubtful status of peah, peah? From: "you shall leave" — leave them from yours [i.e., from what may really be yours, as in the above instance] (Yerushalmi Peah 4:5).⁵³

you shall leave - Leave it before them and let them distribute it. And even if ninety-nine ask him to apportion it and one to leave it to them, the last is heeded, for what he says is [in keeping with] the halachah (Torath Cohanim).⁵⁴

you shall leave them - Peah is given from what is joined to the ground [i.e., in that instance, the poor take it by themselves]. In the case of a vine overhanging a high wall or a high palm [where it would be dangerous for the poor men to pick by themselves], the owner takes it down and sets it before them, as it is written: "To the poor man and to the stranger you shall leave" — leave it before them [to take by themselves]. I might think that the same applies with an overhanging vine or a high palm; it is, therefore, written: "them" [i.e., make it accessible to them] (Yerushalmi Peah 4:1). 55-57

you shall leave them - "them" is a term of exclusion. This form [of hefker (renounced property)] is for the poor, but not for the rich, but what is indicated elsewhere [as hefker] must be for both the poor and the rich [otherwise, it is not regarded as renounced] (Ibid. 6:1).

19:11 Do not steal, and do not deal falsely, and do not lie, one man to another.

Do not steal - Rava said: Why does Scripture state: "Do not steal"? [Derive it (the prohibition against taking another's property) from the interdiction of usury and of cheating.] [We are being taught] "Do not steal" [even if only] to taunt [i.e., with the intention of returning the stolen object]; "Do not steal" [even if] to incur the liability of kefel [paying double, in order to benefit the other!] (Bava Metzia 61b). 59,60

Do not steal - The verse refers to theft of property. But perhaps it refers to theft of person [i.e., kidnapping]! [This cannot be, for] what do the succeeding verses refer to? Property. "Do not steal," then, also refers to property (Sanhedrin 81a).61

19:12 And do not swear in My name falsely and profane the name of your G-d; I am the L-rd.

And do not swear, etc. - When Ravin came, R. Yochanan said: "I ate" [when he did not eat] and "I did not eat" [when he ate] are examples of false oaths, exhorted against in: "Do not swear in My name falsely." And which is a vain oath? Swearing to change what is known to man [e.g., swearing that wood is stone] (Shevuoth 21a). 62,63

And do not swear, etc. - It was taught: R. Yishmael says: "And do not swear in My name falsely" — but you may swear to [rescue yourselves from] murderers, and pillagers, and tax-gougers (Yerushalmi Nedarim 3:4).64

And do not swear in My name - What is the intent of this? Because it is written (*Exodus* 19:7): "Do not take the name of the L-rd your G-d in vain," I might think that there is liability only in respect to His name itself. Whence do I derive for inclusion all of His epithets? From: "And do not swear in My name" — any name by which I am called (*Torath Cohanim*). 65,66

19:13 Do not despoil your neighbor and do not rob. There shall not abide the wages of a hired man with you until the morning.

Do not despoil, etc. - Rava said: "Do not despoil... and do not rob." Despoiling and robbing are the same. Why did Scripture distinguish between them? To make the transgressor liable for two negative commandments (Bava Metzia 111a).67

and do not rob - Rava said: Why does Scripture state a negative commandment in respect to robbing? [Let it be derived from the interdiction of usury and of cheating.] It refers to the withholding of a hired laborer's pay. But that is stated explicitly (*Deuteronomy* 24:14): "Do not despoil a hired man that is poor and needy"! To make the transgressor liable for two negative commandments (*Ibid.* 61b).^{68,69}

There shall not abide - One who withholds the wages of a hired man transgresses five negative commandments and one positive commandment:

"Do not despoil your neighbor"; "Do not rob"; "There shall not abide"; (*Deuteronomy* 24:14): "Do not despoil a hired man that is poor"; (*Ibid.* 15): "Do not allow the sun to go down upon him"; and (*Ibid.*): "On his day you shall give him his wages" (*Ibid.* 111a). 70

There shall not abide the wages of a hired man - If one hired a worker to help him in [gathering] straw and stubble — if the laborer said: "Give me my wages," and the other replied: "Take what you have done for your wages," he is not heeded [it being written: "There shall not abide the wages of a hired man," implying (that he must give) what had been originally stipulated] (*Ibid.* 118a).⁷¹

There shall not abide the wages of a hired man - It was taught: Whence are the wages for [hired] land derived for inclusion in this *mitzvah*? From: "There shall not abide the wages of a hired man" — the wages for anything (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷²

the wages of a hired man with you - Both the wages of a man, of a [hired-out] beast, and of vessels are included in: "There shall not abide the wages of a hired man," it being written: "There shall not abide the wages [lit., "work"] of a hired man with you" — all whose "work" is with you (Bava Metzia 111b).⁷³

the wages of a hired man with you - I might think [that he is in violation of the *mitzvah*] even if the hired man did not [yet] claim his wages; it is, therefore, written: "with you" — to your knowledge [i.e., if you are aware of a claim]. I might think, [that he is in violation of the *mitzvah*] even if he does not have [money at hand with which to pay him]; it is, therefore, written: "with you" — if you have it with you. I might think [that he is in violation of the *mitzvah*] even if he referred him [for payment] to the store-keeper or to the money-changer; it is, therefore, written: "with you" [and in this instance the wages are not abiding with him] (*Ibid.* 112a).^{74,75}

until the morning - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that one hired for the daytime may claim his wages all the night? From: "There shall not abide the wages of a hired man with you until the morning." And whence is it derived that one hired for the night-time may claim his wages all the day? From (*Deuteronomy* 24:15): "On his day you shall give him his wages" (*Ibid.* 110b). ⁷⁶

until the morning - The Rabbis taught: From its being stated: "There shall not abide [(lit., "there shall not spend the night")] the wages of a hired man with you," do I not know that "until the morning" is meant? Why must it be written? To teach that the transgression applies to the first morning alone (*Ibid.*)."

19:14 Do not curse the deaf man, and before the blind man you shall not place a stumbling-block. And you shall fear your G-d; I am the L-rd.

Do not curse the deaf man - [Now is it forbidden to curse a deaf man alone? Why, then, is it written: "Do not curse the deaf man"?] Scripture is speaking of the unfortunate ones among your people [i.e., they are never so unfortunate as to be "immune" to cursing] (Sanhedrin 66a). 78

Do not curse the deaf man - One who curses his neighbor transgresses the negative commandment: "Do not curse the deaf man" [all men being subsumed herein (see above)] (Shevuoth 36a).⁷⁹

and before the blind man, etc. - What is the intent of: "before the blind man"? Before one who is "blind" in respect to a certain matter. If he seeks advice from you, do not give him advice which is not fit for him. Do not tell him: "Leave early in the morning," so that he might be waylaid by robbers; "Leave in the afdternoon," so that he might be overcome by heat. And lest you say: "I am giving him good counsel" [superficially], the matter is known to the heart [and to the Knower of hearts], as it is written: "And you shall fear your G-d; I am the L-rd" (Torath Cohanim). 80

and before the blind man, etc. - It was taught: R. Nathan says: Whence is it derived that one should not stretch forth a cup of wine to a Nazirite or a limb torn from a living animal [ever min hachai] to a Noachide? From: "Before the blind man you shall not place a stumbling-block" (Pesachim 22b).81

and before the blind man, etc. - It was taught: Where is the marking of graves intimated in the Torah? Abbaye said: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block" [and unmarked graves are a

"stumbling-block" to priests in respect to the laws of uncleanliness] (Moed Katan 5a).82

and before the blind man, etc. - It was taught: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block" — Scripture is alluding to one who strikes his elder son [who might thereby "stumble" into transgression of: "Honor your father and your mother"] (*Ibid.* 17a).⁸³

and before the blind man, etc. - R. Huna tore silks in front of Rabbah, his son, saying to himself: "Let me see if he gets angry or not." But perhaps he might get angry and R. Huna be in transgression of: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block"! — R. Huna [proactively] pardoned any offense to his honor (Kiddushin 32a). 84-86

and before the blind man, etc. - R. Ashi had a forest, which he sold to Bei Nura [a house of idolatry]. Ravina queried him: Is this not a violation of: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block" [i.e., Might they not use the wood for their rituals]? He answered: Most wood is used for fuel (Nedarim 62b). 87,88

and before the blind man, etc. - Both the lender and borrower on interest are in transgression of: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block" [the acquiescence of each being a "stumbling-block" to the other] (Bava Metzia 75b).89

and before the blind man, etc. - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: All who lend money without witnesses are in transgression of: "And before the blind man do not place a stumbling-block" [the borrower being tempted to deny the transaction] (*Ibid.*).90

and before the blind man, etc. - R. Pinchas b. Yair went up by one of Rebbi's portals, and, seeing white mules there, said: "The angel of death is in this one's house" [the wound they inflict being fatal]. Rebbi, hearing this, said: "I will sell them," whereupon R. Pinchas said: "And before the blind man [in this case, the prospective buyer,] do not place a stumbling-block" (Chullin 7b). 91,92

and before the blind man, etc. - Abbaye said: We are concerned about "before" [i.e., "before a blind man"], but not about "before before" [e.g., We are not concerned that an idolator who purchases something

from us which we know he will not use for idolatry might sell it to another idolator who might use it thus] (Avodah Zarah 14a).⁹³

And you shall fear your G-d - [What is the intent of this?] In respect to things which are known to the heart, "And you shall fear your G-d" is stated [see above (80)] (Kiddushin 32b).94

19:15 You shall not do wrong in judgment. You shall not lift up the face of the poor, and you shall not favor the face of the great. In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor.

You shall not do wrong in judgment - This teaches us that a judge who perverts justice is called: "wrong," "hated," "revolting," "rejected," "abominable" (Torath Cohanim).95

You shall not lift up the face of the poor - Do not say: He is a poor man, and since I and the rich man are obliged to sustain him, I shall vindicate him in judgment so that he can support himself honorably. To this end it is written: "You shall not lift up the face of the poor" (*Ibid.*).96

and you shall not favor the face of the great - Do not say: He is a wealthy man, the son of great ones, and how can I shame him. To this end it is written: "and you shall not favor the face of the great" (*Ibid.*).⁹⁷

In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor - R. Acha the son of R. Ikka said: "In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor": This teaches us that according to the Torah, even one may sit in judgment; why, then, did the sages require three in monetary litigations? Because of idlers, [who are not versed in the law; whereas if there are three, it is unlikely that at least one not be qualified] (Sanhedrin 3a). 98

In righteousness shall you judge - The Rabbis taught: "In righteousness shall you judge" — that one [of the litigants] not [be allowed] to sit, and the other [made to] stand; one allowed to speak his fill, and the other told to be brief (Shevuoth 30a).99

In righteousness shall you judge - From here it is derived that one is obliged to give his neighbor the benefit of the doubt (*Ibid.*). 100

In righteousness shall you judge - Resh Lakish asked: It is written: "In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor" [connoting routine deliberation], and (*Deuteronomy* 16:20): "Righteousness, righteousness shall you pursue" [connoting minute cross-examination]. How are these to be reconciled? The second applies to a case where deception is suspected, and the first to a case where no deception is suspected (*Ibid.* 32b). 101,102

In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor - R. Yosef taught: "In righteousness shall you judge your neighbor" [Heb., "amitecha"]: "im she'itecha" ["one who is with you"] in Torah and in mitzvoth — exert yourself to judge him well (Ibid. 30a). 103

19:16 Do not go as a tale-bearer among your people. Do not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor. I am the L-rd.

Do not go as a tale-bearer - It was taught: Whence is derived the exhortation against giving one an evil name? R. Elazar said: "Do not go as a tale-bearer" (Kethuvoth 46a). 104

Do not go as a tale-bearer [Heb., "rachil"] - This is an exhortation to beth-din not to be soft ["rach"] to one and hard to another (Ibid.). 105

Do not go as a tale-bearer - If two ruled "innocent," and one "guilty," it is written "innocent" [on the decision] by reason of: "Do not go as a tale-bearer" (Sanhedrin 30a). 106

Do not go as a tale-bearer - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that the judge should not say: I found you innocent, but my fellow-judges found you guilty. What can I do? They are the majority. [It is derived] from: "Do not go as a tale-bearer" (Ibid. 31a). 107

Do not go as a tale-bearer - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: Tale-bearing and slander are one and the same [Why, then, is the second denominated by the first?] R. Nechemiah taught: [to teach that] one should not be as a merchant ["rochel" (similar to "rechiluth" - tale-bearing)], who "purveys" the words of one to another (Yerushalmi Peah 1:1). 108

Do not stand, etc. - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one

pursues another to kill him, the second may be saved by [taking] the life of the first? From: "Do not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor" (Sanhedrin 73a). 109

Do not stand, etc. - Whence is it derived that if one sees his neighbor drowning in the sea, being dragged by an animal, or being waylaid by robbers — whence is it derived that he is obliged to save him? From: "Do not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor" (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁰

Do not stand, etc. - Whence is it derived that if you are in a position to testify on behalf of your friend, you are not permitted to remain silent? From: "Do not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor" (Torath Cohanim).¹¹¹

19:17 Do not hate your brother in your heart. Reprove, reprove, your brother, and do not bear sin because of him.

Do not hate your brother - But if he sees in him something indecent, it is permitted to hate him. R. Nachman B. Yitzchak said: It is a *mitzvah* to hate him, as it is written (*Proverbs* 8:13): "The fear of the L-rd is to hate evil" (*Pesachim* 113b).¹¹²

in your heart - The Rabbis taught: "Do not hate your brother" — I might think [the meaning is] not to strike him, not to smite him, not to curse him; it is, therefore, written: "Do not hate your brother in your heart" — Scripture is speaking of hatred in the heart (Erchin 16b).¹¹³

Reprove, reprove - R. Ila'a said in the name of R. Elazar b. R. Shimon: Just as it is a *mitzvah* to say what will be heeded, so is it a *mitzvah* not to say what will not be heeded [it being written: "Reprove, reprove" — reprove him who accepts reproof] (Yevamoth 65b, see Rashi). 114

Reprove, reprove - This tells me only of [reproof from] teacher to student. Whence do I derive the same for student to teacher? From: "Reprove, reprove" — in any instance (Bava Metzia 31a). 115

Reprove, reprove - "Reprove" — even up to a hundred times (Ibid.). 116

Reprove, reprove - Up to which point must one reprove? Rav said: Until he is smitten for reproving (*Erchin* 16b). 117

and do not bear sin because of him - I might think that he is to reprove him even if his face turns colors from shame; it is, therefore, written: "and do not bear sin because of [shaming] him" (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁸

19:18 Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge against the children of your people. And you shall love your neighbor as yourself; I am the L-rd.

Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge - It was taught: Which is revenge and which is bearing a grudge? If one said: Lend me your scythe, and he was refused; and the next day the other said to him: Lend me your spade — If he replied: I will not lend it to you, just as you did not lend to me — this is revenge; and if he replied: Here it is — I am not like you, who do not lend — this is bearing a grudge (Yoma 23a). 119

Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge - R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Shimon b. Yochai: Any Torah scholar who does not take revenge and does not bear a grudge, as a serpent, is no Torah scholar. And though it is written: "Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge," this is in respect to monetary matters (*Ibid.*). 120

Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge - [How is: "Do not take revenge, and do not bear a grudge" to be understood? It is comparable to a knife slipping while one is slicing meat and cutting his hand. Will he thereupon cut his other hand? This is precisely the same] (Yerushalmi Nedarim 9:4). 121

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - It was taught: Whence is it derived that those put to death by the sword are cut at the throat? R. Nachman said in the name of Rabbah b. Avuhah: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself" — choose a humane death for him [i.e., the one which is least painful] (Kethuvoth 37b). 122

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: One is forbidden to marry a woman before he sees her, for perhaps he will find in her something revolting, which shall make her detestable to him; and the Torah has written: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Kiddushin 41a). 123

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - The stoning platform was two floors in height, the victim's height making three. Was so much needed [to kill him? (i.e., Would he not die even if he fell from a lower height?)] R. Nachman said: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself" — choose a humane death for him [i.e., the greater height made for a quicker death] (Sanhedrin 45a). 124,125

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - It was asked: May a son perform blood-letting upon his father [in view of the possibility that he might wound him in the process]? R. Mathna answered: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself" [the assumption being that the son would want the same done to him by his own son were he in a similar situation] (*Ibid.* 84b).¹²⁶

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - R. Chisda said: One is forbidden to cohabit with his wife in the daytime, it being written: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself." What is the connection? Abbaye answered: He might notice something revolting in her, which would render her repulsive to him (Niddah 17a). 127

And you shall love your neighbor as yourself - It was taught: R. Akiva said: "And you shall love your neighbor as yourself" — this is an allembracing principle in Torah (Yerushalmi Nedarim 9:4). 128

I am the L-rd - What is the rationale for loving your neighbor as yourself? "I am the L-rd" — I, the L-rd, have created him for My honor. Therefore, if he is just and upright, love him; and if not, do not love him (Avoth d'R. Nathan 16). 129

19:19 My statutes you shall keep. Your beast you shall not mate with a different breed. Your field you shall not sow with diverse seeds. And a mingled, interwoven garment shall not come upon you.

My statutes you shall keep - It was taught: Shmuel said: What is the intent of: "My statutes you shall keep. Your beast you shall not mate, etc."? The statutes that I have already established for you [within the realm of nature (such as the mating of animals with their own kind)], heed them now [as laws of Torah] (Kiddushin 39a).¹³⁰

My statutes you shall keep - It was taught: Whence is it derived that it is forbidden to graft a non-fruit-bearing tree with a fruit-bearing tree, a fruit-bearing tree with a non-fruit-bearing tree, or one type of fruit-bearing tree with a different type? From: "My statutes you shall keep" (Torath Cohanim).¹³¹

Your beast - Both oxen and other beasts are subsumed in the *mitzvah* against interbreeding. Whence is this derived? From: "Your beast" [here] - "Your beasts" (*Deuteronomy* 4:14) in respect to Sabbath [where it is explicitly stated: "and your ox and your ass and all your beasts"] (*Bava Kamma* 54b). 132

Your beast - This tells us only of: "your beast." Whence are derived [for inclusion in the interdiction]: the beasts of others, beasts with animals, animals with beasts, clean animals with unclean ones, unclean ones with clean ones? From: "My statutes [which I have instituted within nature (see above [130])] you shall keep" (Torath Cohanim).¹³³

you shall not mate - It was taught: I might think that it is forbidden to stand males [of one kind of animal] next to females [of another] and females next to males; it is, therefore, written: "Your beast you shall not mate" — the prohibition is against mating alone (Yerushalmi Kilaim 8:2).134

you shall not mate with a different breed - It was taught: If it were written only: "Your beast you shall not mate," I might think that one was forbidden to hold the female when the male [even of the same breed] came upon it; it is, therefore, written: "with a different breed" (Bava Metzia 91a).¹³⁵

Your field - "your field" — to exclude [from prohibition] the sowing of mixed seeds [of the vineyard] outside of Eretz Yisrael (Kiddushin 39a).¹³⁶

Your field - "your field" is juxtaposed with "your beast" [to teach that] just as with "your beast" there is a prohibition against interbreeding, so with "your field," there is a prohibition against grafting; and just as with "your beast" the prohibition applies both in and outside of Eretz Yisrael, so with your field the prohibition applies both in and outside of Eretz Yisrael (*Ibid.*). 137,138

Your field - "your field" is juxtaposed with "your beast" [to teach that] just as with your beast, what issues from it [in the case of interbreeding] is permitted, so with your field, what issues from it [in the case of grafting] is permitted (Chullin 115a). 139

you shall not sow - This tells me only of sowing. Whence is [the prohibition against] nurturing [of mixed seed already planted] derived? From: "a different breed [(or seed)] your field [implying what is already in the field] you shall not" (Moed Katan 2b). 140

And a garment - What is the intent of this [i.e., Why mention "garment"?] Because it is written (*Deuteronomy* 22:11): "You shall not wear an interweaving, wool and linen together," I might think it is forbidden to wear strips of wool and stalks of flax; it is, therefore, written: "And a garment" (Torath Cohanim). 141,142

And a mingled garment - It was taught: I might think that any type of intermixture is forbidden: even a black ox with a white one, two types of wheat, two types of barley, two types of wool, two types of flax — it is, therefore, written in respect to garments (*Deuteronomy* 22:11): "You shall not wear an interweaving, wool and linen together" — Just as the admixture in respect to garments is of two different kinds, so, [prohibited] admixtures in all instances are of two distinct kinds [and not two types of the same kind] (*Yerushalmi Kilaim* 1:1).¹⁴³

interwoven - It must be hackled, spun, and twined ["shua, tavui, vanuz" - acronym on "sha'atnez" ("interwoven")] (Niddah 61b).144

interwoven - [I might think that felt is forbidden]; it is, therefore, written "sha'atnez" — that which is hackled, spun, and twined [see above] (Torath Cohanim). 145

shall not come upon you - You may not put it upon yourself, but you may spread it out beneath you [according to Scripture]. The sages, however, have forbidden it, lest a strand entwine itself on his flesh (Beitzah 14b). 146

shall not come upon you - Let us analyze this. It is written (Deuteronomy 22:11): "You shall not wear an interweaving." Why, then, is it necessary to say: "there shall not come upon you, etc."? It is necessary. For if only: "You shall not wear" were written, I would

think that only wearing, where there is much benefit, was forbidden, but merely putting it upon oneself, where there is not much benefit, was not forbidden; it is, therefore, written: "there shall not come upon you" (Yevamoth 4b).¹⁴⁷

19:20 And a man, if he lie with a woman, a lying of seed, and she be a maidservant, bound to a man, and redeemed she has not been redeemed, or freedom not been given to her — there shall be censure; they shall not die, for she was not freed.

And a man - "a man," to exclude a minor. I might think that I exclude one older than nine years and one day [even though he might be potent]; it is, therefore, written: "And a man" [connoting inclusion] (Torath Cohanim). 148

with a woman - to exclude a minor [less than three years and one day, who is not fit for intercourse] (*Ibid.*).¹⁴⁹

a lying of seed - It was taught: Whence is it derived that peripheral [unconsummated] intercourse with those interdicted by negative commandment incurs liability? Since the Torah stipulates "a lying of seed" in respect to a bound maidservant, it may be inferred that with respect to the [others] interdicted by negative commandment peripheral intercourse is sufficient for liability (Yevamoth 55a). 150

a lying of seed - to exclude peripheral intercourse; to exclude abnormal [sodomic] intercourse (Krituth 9a). 151

and she be a maidservant - One who lives with five bound maidservants in one time period incurs liability for each one, it being written: "if he lie with a woman... and she be a maidservant" — to distinguish between each maidservant [for purposes of the aforementioned liability] (*Ibid.*). 152,153

a maidservant bound to a man - R. Yitzchak said: There is liability only with a maidservant who has already had intercourse, it being written: "a maidservant bound to [Heb., necherefeth (lit., "changed by")] a man." And whence is it derived that "necherefeth" connotes "changed"?

From (II Samuel 17:19): "And she spread the crushed corn ["harifoth" — changed from its original state] upon it" (Ibid. 11a). 154,155

bound to a man - It was taught: If one says to a woman: "You are my bound one ["charufathi"], she is betrothed, for it is written: "bound [necherefeth] to a man" (Kiddushin 6a). 156

bound to a man - The wife of one who was half-servant, half-free leaves [her married state] with the death of her husband, it being written [in respect to the comparable half-freedwoman, half-maidservant] "bound [necherefeth] to a man" [and just as she is regarded as bound in marriage, all the rules of marriage (including that of leaving the married state at the death of the husband) applying to her, so, the comparable half-freedman, half-servant]. Achilles, the convert, rendered it ["necherefeth"] as "deflowered by a man," as it is written (II Samuel 17:19): "And she spread the crushed corn ["harifoth" — changed from its original state] upon it" (Yerushalmi Kiddushin 1:1). 157

and redeemed she has not been redeemed - The Rabbis taught: If, "and redeemed," I might think that she had been completely redeemed; it is, therefore, written: "she has not been redeemed." If: "she has not been redeemed," I might think that she had not been redeemed at all; it is, therefore, written: "and redeemed." How is this to be understood—"redeemed and not redeemed"? Scripture is speaking of one who is half-maidservant, half-freedwoman, and betrothed to a Hebrew manservant (Krituth 11a). 158

not been given to her - The Rabbis taught: Every mitzvah which is binding upon a woman is binding upon a servant [a Canaanite servant who underwent circumcision and immersion], and every mitzvah which is not binding upon a woman [such as time-oriented positive commandments] is not binding upon a servant. Whence is this derived? From: "her" ["or freedom not been given to her" (the status of the afore-mentioned Canaanite servant being similar to hers in respect to mitzvoth)] - "her" in respect to a [Jewish] woman [viz., (Deuteronomy 24:3): "And he shall write to her a writ of divorce" (an equivalence being posited between the referents of the two 'hers")] (Chagigah 4a). 159

not been given to her - The Rabbis taught: "and redeemed" — this tells

me only of [the possibility of redemption by] money. Whence is [such possibility by] writ derived? From: "or freedom not been given to her," and, elsewhere (Deuteronomy 24:3): "And he shall write to her a writ of divorce" — just as there, a writ; here, too, a writ (Gittin 41b). 160,161

not been given to her - The Rabbis taught: If one freed half of his servant, he does not acquire his freedom, an equivalence being posited ["her"-"her"] from what is stated in respect to [the divorce of] a [Jewish] woman. Just as in the latter instance, half of her cannot [be divorced], so in respect to a servant half of him cannot [be freed] (Ibid.). 162

not been given to her - The Rabbis taught: A writ of emancipation must be written expressly for the particular servant who is to be freed, it being stated: "or freedom not been given to her" (Yerushalmi Sotah 2:2)¹⁶³

there shall be censure - The Rabbis taught: "there shall be censure" [lit., "she shall be censured"] — this teaches us that she receives stripes. And whence is it derived that "censure" ["bikkoreth"] alludes to stripes? R. Yitzchak said: [From:] she shall be "subject to the reading" ["kriah" — i.e., the verse that is read during the administration of stripes], as it was taught (Makkoth 22b): The senior judge reads, the second counts, the third says: "Smite him." R. Ashi said ["bikkoreth" intimates:] he shall be subject to discrimination ["bikkur" — i.e., ascertainment that the number of stripes is divisible by three], as it was taught: He is assessed only in terms of stripes that lend themselves to thirds. I might think that both of them receive stripes; it is, therefore written: "there shall be" [lit., "she shall be"] — she receives stripes, but not he (Krituth 11a). 164,165

there shall be censure - [lit., "she shall be censured" (i.e., "smitten")]. Let us analyze this. Until this point Scripture has been speaking of the man. Why, then, is it not first written: "And he shall bring his guilt-offering," and then: "she shall be censured"? This is the intent of Scripture: If she is censurable [i.e., not a minor, etc.], then he is to bring his guilt-offering; but if she is not censurable, he is not to bring his guilt-offering (Ibid.). 166,167

they shall not die, for she was not freed - It was said: A half-maidservant, half-freedwoman, who was betrothed to Reuven, and then

freed and betrothed to Shimon — R. Zeira said: The first betrothal is thereupon [(upon her emancipation)] consummated. Whence is this derived? From: "they shall not die, for she was not freed" [the implication being that] if she were freed, they are to die [the marriage having, apparently, been consummated by the emancipation] (Gittin 43b). 168

- 19:21 And he shall bring his guilt-offering to the L-rd, to the door of the tent of meeting, a ram for a guilt-offering.
- 19:22 And the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the guilt-offering before the L-rd because of his sin which he has sinned, and it shall be forgiven him [of] his sin which he has sinned.

because of the sin which he has sinned - This teaches us that he brings one offering for numerous acts of coitus [within the same time period] (Krituth 9a). 169

of his sin which he has sinned - What is the intent of this [repetition]? To equate a deliberate sin with an inadvertent one [for purposes of bringing an offering] (*Ibid.*). 170

19:23 And when you come to the land and you plant every food tree, then you shall count as forbidden its fruit. Three years it shall be to you forbidden; it shall not be eaten.

when you come - to exclude what was planted by the gentiles before the Jews entered the land as not being bound by *arlah* [the laws of forbidden fruit] (Yerushalmi Arlah 1:2).¹⁷¹

to the land - I might think [that the laws of arlah apply] when they come to trans-Jordan; it is, therefore, written: "to the land" — to the specific land [i.e., Eretz Yisrael proper] (Torath Cohanim). 172

when you come...and you plant - This teaches us that even if they planted before they conquered the land, the laws of arlah apply (Yerushalmi Arlah 1:2). 173

and you plant - Both those who plant, sink a vine, or engraft are liable to the laws of arlah (Rosh Hashanah 9b). 174

and you plant - It was taught: R. Yanai said: A tree which was planted in a house comes under the laws of arlah [Why so? It is written: "and you plant" — wherever you plant] (Yerushalmi Arlah 1:2).175

and you plant - to exclude what grows of itself as not coming under the laws of arlah (Tosefta Arlah 1).¹⁷⁶

every food tree - It was taught: R. Meir said: From its being stated: "and you plant every tree... it shall not be eaten," do I not know that it is a food tree? Why, then, must it be explicitly stated? To include [under the laws of arlah] a tree, the taste of whose fruit and bark are the same. And which is this? A pepper tree. To teach us that peppers come under the laws of arlah, and to teach us that Eretz Yisrael lacks nothing, as it is written (Deuteronomy 8:9): "You shall lack nothing in it" (Berachoth 36b).177

food tree - What is for food comes under the laws of *arlah*; what is for fencing, and beams, and fuel does not (*Yerushalmi Arlah* 1:1). 178

its fruit - ["eth piryo"] — lit., "along with" its fruit] — to include [in the laws of arlah] what is conjoined with the fruit, i.e., those parts which serve as protection for it (Berachoth 36b).¹⁷⁹

its fruit - Stripes are not administered for [drinking what is exuded from] arlah fruit, with the exception of that which is exuded from olives and grapes. Why so? We derive: "fruit" - "fruit" from the laws of first-fruits [which apply to olives and grapes] (Chullin 121a). 180

its fruit - to exclude leaves, palm branches, vine sap, and bud sap. I might think that early grapes and half-ripe grapes are also excluded; it is, therefore, written: "eth piryo" ["along with" its fruit, to include the latter] (Torath Cohanim). 181, 182

Three years - The first day of Tishrei is the New Year for plants. Whence is this derived? It is written: "Three years...forbidden," and (*Ibid.* 24): "And in the fourth *year*"; and we derive: "year" - "year" as referring to Tishrei, it being written (*Deuteronomy* 11:12): "From the

beginning of the *year*" [the "beginning" there understood to be Tishrei] (Rosh Hashanah 9b). 183,184

Three years it shall be - I might think that for three years arlah fruits are forbidden, but after three years they are permitted; it is, therefore, written: "it shall be" [i.e., it shall remain forbidden for all time] (Torath Cohanim). 185

it shall be to you - "to you" [plural] — to include [as coming under the laws of arlah] what is planted for all (Pesachim 22b). 186

it shall not be eaten - This tells us only of the ban on eating. Whence is it derived that one may not benefit from it, or dye with it, or use it to kindle his lamp? From: "And you shall be *forbidden*., its being *forbidden*... *forbidden*" [so, literally, in the Hebrew] — to include [as forbidden] all of the above (*Ibid*.).¹⁸⁷

19:24 And in the fourth year all of its fruit shall be holy for praise to the L-rd.

And in the fourth year - The Rabbis taught: If one plants, or sinks a vine, or engrafts, thirty days before Rosh Hashanah, then [with the advent of Rosh Hashanah] it is considered a one-year growth [for purposes of arlah] and is forbidden until the fifteenth day of Shevat [the New Year of trees]. If he does so less than thirty days before Rosh Hashanah, it is not considered a one-year growth; for it is written: "And in the fourth year...(25) and in the fifth year" — sometimes [as in the latter instance of less than thirty days] it is in its fourth year and still forbidden because of arlah [fruits of the first three years], and sometimes it is in its fifth year and still forbidden because of revai [fruits of the fourth year] (Rosh Hashanah 9 and 10a). 188

all of its fruit shall be holy - It was taught: R. Yossi says: "Fruit" you redeem, but you do not redeem half-ripe fruit or berries (Yerushalmi Arlah 1:5). 189

holy - It is written here: "holy," and, in respect to tithes (*Ibid.* 27:30): "holy." Just as tithes are subject to a one-fifth surcharge [for redemption] and removal [from the house in the fourth and seventh

years of the *shemitah* period], so, the *revai* fruits are subject to the one-fifth surcharge and removal (*Kiddushin* 54b). 190,191

holy - It is written here: "holy," and, in respect to tithes (*Ibid.* 27:30): "holy." Just as with holiness in respect to tithes, though they are sacred property, still, as regards redemption, Scripture placed them in his possession, so with holiness in respect to *revai* fruits; though they are not his property, still, as regards transference to non-sacred status, Scripture placed them in his possession (*Bava Kamma* 69b). 192,193

holy - It is as consecrated food in that Hallel is recited over it and mourners are forbidden to eat it (Yerushalmi Ma'aser Sheni 5:2). 194

holy for praise - It was taught: What is the intent of: "hilulim" [lit., "praises"]? One ["hilulim" similar to "chilulim"] to teach that he may redeem it ["achlei"] and then eat it; the other, to teach that what requires song [i.e., wine, over which benedictions are made,] requires redemption, and that what does not require song does not require redemption [so that it is only the vineyard in effect, which is subject to the laws of revai fruits] (Berachoth 35a). 195

holy for praise - It was taught: Whence is it derived that it requires redemption [if he wishes to eat it outside of Jerusalem]? From: "holy for priase" ["kodesh hiluim"], and the Rabbis are not averse to expounding "h" ["hilulim"] as "ch" ["chilulim" — see above] (Yerushalmi Ma'aser Sheni 5:2). 196

holy for praise to the L-rd - The Rabbis taught: "holy for praise to the L-rd" — this ["hilulim," lit., "praises"] teaches us that a benediction is required before and after. From here, R. Akiva would say: One is forbidden to partake of anything without pronouncing a benediction (Berachoth 35a). 197,198

19:25 And in the fifth year you may eat its fruit to increase for you its produce; I am the L-rd your G-d.

to increase for you its produce - It was taught: Rebbi says: It is written here: "to increase for you its produce," and, elsewhere (*Deuteronomy* 22:9): "and the produce of the vineyard." Just as there, "the vineyard,"

here, too, "the vineyard" [to teach that the laws of *revai* are applicable only to the vineyard] (*Ibid.*). 199

to increase for you its produce - It was taught: R. Akiva says: Scripture here "addresses itself" to the evil inclination. Lest one lament: "I must labor fruitlessly for four years!" it is, therefore, written [as an incentive]: "to increase for you its produce" (Torath Cohanim).²⁰⁰

its produce - This teaches us that only [matured] produce is redeemed. From here it is derived (Ma'aser Sheni 5): Revai is not redeemed until it arrives at the tithing season (Ibid.).²⁰¹

19:26 You shall not eat over the blood. Do not practice divination, and do not practice soothsaying.

You shall not eat over the blood - It was taught: R. Yossi b. Chanina said in the name of R. Eliezer b. Yaakov: "You shall not eat over the blood" — Do not eat before praying for your blood [i.e., your lives] (Berachoth 10b).²⁰²

You shall not eat over the blood - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one who eats of an animal before it expires transgresses a negative commandment? From: "You shall not eat over the blood" [i.e., while the life-blood is still in the animal] (Sanhedrin 63a).²⁰³

You shall not eat over the blood - What is the intent of: "You shall not eat over the blood"? You shall not eat flesh [of an offering] while the blood is still in the salver [and has not yet been sprinkled] (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁴

You shall not eat over the blood - It was taught: R. Dosa says: Whence is it derived that a meal of consolation is not eaten over those executed by the *beth-din*? From: "You shall not eat over the blood" (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁵

You shall not eat over the blood - It was taught: R. Akiva says: Whence is it derived that a Sanhedrin which imposed the death penalty is not to eat that entire day? From: "You shall not eat over the blood" (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁶

You shall not eat over the blood - It was taught: R. Yochanan says: "You shall not eat over the blood" — this is an exhortation to a

[potential] "rebellious son" [i.e., You shall not eat in such a manner as to be driven to the spilling of blood] (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁷

Do not practice divination - The Rabbis taught: "divination" — this refers to one's divining [propitious times on the basis of such observations as]: "His bread has fallen from his mouth," "His staff has fallen from his hand," "His son is calling him from behind," "A raven is calling to him," "A deer has crossed his path," "A snake is on his right, and a fox on his left," "Do not begin [counting] with me," "It is morning," "It is the New Moon," "It is Sabbath eve" (Ibid. 65b).²⁰⁸

Do not practice divination, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "Do not practice divination, and do not practice soothsaying" — in the manner of those who divine by weasels, birds, and fish (*Ibid.* 66a).²⁰⁹

Do not practice divination, etc. - R. Eliezer b. Yaakov taught: "Do not practice divination, and do not practice soothsaying" — Though there is no validity in divination, there is, in signs — on condition that there are three such signs, as in the instances of (*Genesis* 48:7): "And I, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me, etc.," (*Ibid.* 42:36): "Joseph is not, and Shimon is not, etc." (*Yerushalmi Shabbath* 6:9). 210,211

Do not practice divination, etc. - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: "Do not practice divination, and do not practice sooth-saying" — Now are not divination and soothsaying in the general category of necromancy? Why, then, are they singled out individually? [To render each one liable by itself (and not necessarily in accompaniment with the other)] (*Ibid.* 7:2).²¹²

and do not practice soothsaying - The Rabbis taught: What is "sooth-saying"? "Capturing the eyes" [i.e., giving others the erroneous impression that one is performing wonders] (Sanhedrin 65b).²¹³

19:27 Do not round off the corners of your head, and do not destroy the corners of your beard.

Do not round off - A Tanna taught in the presence of R. Chisda: Both the doer and the subject receive stripes [This is so if the second actively assists the first. Why so? For it is written: "Do not round off" (the

Hebrew implying both the doer and the subject)] (see Rashi, *Makkoth* 20b).²¹⁴

Do not round off, etc. - Women are not liable for rounding off. Why so? It is written: "Do not round off the corners of your head, and do not destroy the corners of your beard" — all who are subject to destroying [i.e., the law against destroying the beard] are subject to rounding off, and all who are not subject to destroying are not subject to rounding off; and women, since they are not subject to destroying, are not subject to rounding off (Kiddushin 35b).²¹⁵

the corners of your head - The Rabbis taught: "the corners of the head" — the edges of the head. What does this signify? Aligning the hair of one's temples with that behind his ears and that of his forehead (Makkoth 20b).²¹⁶

and do not destroy - See (*Ibid. 21:5*): "And the corners of their beards they shall not shave"

and the corners of your beard - The Rabbis taught "the corners of your beard — the edges of the beard." What does this signify? The pointed edges of his chin (*Ibid.*).²¹⁷

the corners of your beard - Women are not liable for destruction of the corners of the beard [if they have one]. Why so? It is written: "and do not destroy the corners of your beard," and not the beard of your wife (Kiddushin 35b).²¹⁸

19:28 And a cutting for a [dead] person, you shall not make in your flesh; and writing that is engraved you shall not make upon yourselves. I am the L-rd.

And a cutting - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one who lacerates himself five times for one person is liable for each laceration? From: "And a cutting," implying liability for each cutting (Makkoth 20b).²¹⁹

And a cutting for a [dead] person - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if one lacerated himself [out of anguish] over his house that collapsed or over his ship that sank in the sea he would also be liable; it

is, therefore, written: "for a [dead] person" — he is liable for a person alone (*Ibid.*).²²⁰

And a cutting for a [dead] person - It was taught: R. Yossi says: Whence is it derived that one who lacerates himself five times, each laceration for a different dead person, is liable for each one? From: "And a cutting for a [dead] person" (Ibid.).²²¹

and writing that is engraved - In engraved writing: if one writes, but does not engrave [into the skin]; or if he engraves, but does not write, he is not liable. He is liable only when he writes and engraves: with ink, bluing, or anything else that leaves an impression (*Ibid.* 21b).²²²

19:29 Do not profane your daughter to make her a harlot, lest the land fall into harlotry and the land be filled with lewdness.

Do not profane, etc. - I might think that Scripture is here speaking of a cohain [a priest] who marries his daughter to a Levite or an Israelite; it is, therefore, written: "to make her a harlot." Scripture is speaking of the profanation of harlotry, of one who prostitutes his daughter, outside of wedlock (Sanhedrin 76a). 223,224

Do not profane, etc. - R. Eliezer says: This refers to one who weds his daughter to an old man. R. Akiva says: It refers to one who delays his daughter's marriage after she has reached the age of maturity [both of the above being an inducement to promiscuity] (*Ibid.*).²²⁵

and the land be filled with lewdness - R. Eliezer b. Yaakov says: If a man lived with many women, without remembering which; and, similarly, if a woman lived with many men and did not know which one she conceived by, one might marry his own daughter or sister and the world be filled with mamzerim [bastards]. It is in this connection that Scripture writes: "and the land be filled with lewdness" (Yevamoth 37b). 226

and the land be filled with lewdness - It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Yaakov says: A man should not marry a woman in one land and then go and marry a woman in a different land, lest the children of the two

women come together and a brother marry his sister, and the world be filled with *mamzerim*. It is in this connection that Scripture writes: "and the land be filled with lewdness" (*Ibid*.).²²⁷

lewdness ["zimah"] - What is signified by "zimah"? "Zo mah hi" — ["This one — what is it?" (i.e., What is its parentage?)] (Nedarim 51a). 228

19:30 My Sabbaths you shall keep, and My sanctuary you shall fear; I am the L-rd.

My Sabbaths you shall keep - It was taught: I might think that the building of the Temple countermanded the [keeping of the] Sabbath; it is, therefore, written: "My Sabbaths you shall keep, and My sanctuary you shall fear" — you are all obligated to honor Me (Yevamoth 6a).²²⁹

and My sanctuary you shall fear - It was taught: I might think that one should fear the sanctuary, [if not for the following]: In respect to the Sabbath, "keeping," is stated, and, in respect to the sanctuary, "fear." Just as with the "keeping" of the Sabbath, it is not the Sabbath that is feared, but He that exhorted concerning it, so, with the "fear" of the sanctuary, it is not the sanctuary that is feared, but He that exhorted concerning it (*Ibid.*).^{230,231}

and My sanctuary you shall fear - This tells me only of the time when the Temple existed. Whence do I derive the same [i.e., that one must deport himself with fear — at the Temple site] even when the Temple does not exist? From: "My Sabbaths you shall keep, and My sanctuary you shall fear." Just as the keeping of Sabbath is eternal, so fear of the sanctuary is eternal (*Ibid.*).²³²

19:31 Do not turn to the *ovoth* and to the *yidonim*. Do not seek them out to be defiled by them. I am the L-rd your G-d.

Do not turn, etc. - This is an exhortation against a ba'al ov [see below] (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 7:10).²³³

to the ovoth, etc. - "ba'al ov" — this is a wizard, who speaks from his armpits; "yidoni" — this is one who speaks [in magical fashion]

through his mouth. They [the practitioners] incur the penalty of stoning, and those who solicit them transgress an exhortation [see above] (Sanhedrin 65a).²³⁴⁻²³⁶

to the ovoth, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "ba'al ov" — this is one who speaks from between the joints and from his armpits; "yidoni" — this is one who places in his mouth the bone of a yidoa [a kind of animal], which speaks of itself (*Ibid.*).²³⁷

Do not seek, etc. - This teaches us that they do not come upon one unless he turns his mind to them and defiles himself through them (Torath Cohanim).²³⁸

19:32 Before the hoary head you shall rise, and you shall honor the face of the elder. And you shall fear your G-d; I am the L-rd.

Before the hoary head you shall rise, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "the hoary head" — this implies any hoary head. I might think that one must rise even for a wicked old man; it is, therefore, written: "and you shall honor the face of the elder," an elder being one who has acquired wisdom [i.e., the wisdom of virtue] (Kiddushin 32b).²³⁹⁻²⁴¹

you shall rise, and you shall honor - I might think that one must rise before him in the privy and in the bath-house; it is, therefore, written: "you shall rise, and you shall honor" — rising is required only where it conduces to honor (*Ibid.*).²⁴²

you shall rise, and you shall honor - Rising is being likened to honoring, and honoring to rising, viz.: Just as honoring does not entail a cessation of labor, so, only that rising is required which does not entail a cessation of labor; and just as rising does not entail [appreciable] monetary loss, so only that type of honoring is required which does not entail monetary loss (*Ibid.* 33a).^{243,244}

you shall rise, and you shall honor - It was taught: What is honorific rising? [Rising upon the elder's entering into] one's four ells (*Ibid.*).²⁴⁵

and you shall honor - What constitutes honoring? Not sitting in his

place, not speaking in his place, and not contradicting his words (*Torath Cohanim*). ²⁴⁶

and you shall honor the face of the elder - It was taught: An ordained sage is forgiven for all of his sins. Whence is this derived? From: "and you shall honor the face of the elder," followed by (33): "And if there dwell among you a stranger [i.e., a proselyte]" — just as a proselyte is forgiven for all of his sins, so a sage, upon ordainment, is forgiven for all of his sins (Yerushalmi Bikkurim 3:3).²⁴⁷

And you shall fear your G-d - I might think that one may close his eyes as if not to see him [the approaching elder]; it is, therefore, written: "you shall rise... and you shall fear" — what is known to the heart [and, therefore, to the Knower of hearts] is subject to: "And you shall fear your G-d" (Kiddushin 32b).²⁴⁸

And you shall fear your G-d - It was taught: R. Shimon b. Elazar says: Whence is it derived that the elder should not cause others to exert themselves for him? From: "elder. And you [(for purposes of this homily,) the elder] shall fear" (*Ibid.*).²⁴⁹

And you shall fear your G-d - R. Elazar said: Any Torah scholar who does not rise before his master is called "wicked," does not live long, and forgets his learning, as it is written (Koheleth 8:13): "But there shall not be good [i.e., Torah] with the wicked one, and he shall not prolong his days, like the shadow, because he does not fear before the L-rd" [i.e., before his master, whom he must fear as the L-rd]. I would not know precisely what was signified by this "fear," had it not been written: "And you shall fear your G-d," which [in context ("you shall rise, etc.")] is seen to indicate rising (Ibid. 33b). 250

I am the L-rd - R. Simon said: Before the hoary head you shall rise, and you shall honor the face of the elder... I am the L-rd"— The Holy One Blessed be He is herein saying of Himself: "I am the first to have fulfilled the mitzvah of standing before an elder" [in waiting upon Abraham (see Genesis 18)] (Yerushalmi Bikkurim 3:3).²⁵¹

19:33 And if there dwell among you a stranger in your land, you shall not oppress him.

And if there dwell, etc. - Righteous converts are included in the amidah prayer with the righteous of the Jews, it being written: "and you shall honor the face of the elder," followed by: "And if there dwell among you a stranger [i.e., a proselyte]" (Megillah 17b).²⁵²

And if there dwell among you a stranger - The Rabbis taught: If one came and said: I am a proselyte, I might think that he is to be accepted as such; it is, therefore, written: "among you" — when he is acknowledged among you [to be a proselyte]. If he comes along with his witnesses [that he is a proselyte], whence is it derived [that he is to be accepted]? From: "And if there dwell, etc." (Yevamoth 46b).²⁵³

in your land. This tells me only that converts are accepted in the land [i.e., Eretz Yisrael]. Whence do we derive that they are also accepted outside the land? From: "And if there dwell among you a stranger"—"among you"— wherever you are found (Ibid.).²⁵⁴

in your land - What is the intent of this? To teach that even in Eretz Yisrael converts are accepted. For I might think that they are converting only because of the richness of the land; and now, too, though this richness does not exist, there are still [the benefits of] leket, shikchah, peah, and the poor man's tithe, for which reason I might think they are not to be accepted; it is, therefore, written that they are accepted (Ibid. 47a).²⁵⁵

you shall not oppress him - Scripture here speaks of verbal oppression. What is verbal oppression? He should not say to him: "The mouth which just shortly before ate carcasses and treifah, and revolting, creeping things is now coming to learn Torah from the mouth of the Almighty!" And if he is the son of converts, he should not say to him: "Remember the deeds of your fathers" (Bava Metzia 58b). 256,257

you shall not oppress him - The Rabbis taught: He who oppresses the convert transgresses three negative commandments, viz. (*Exodus* 22:20): "And a stranger you shall not oppress", (here): "And if there dwell among you a stranger...you shall not oppress him", and (*Leviticus* 25:17): "And you shall not oppress, one man his neighbor", a convert being in the category of one's neighbor (*Ibid.* 59b). ²⁵⁸

19:34 As the home-born among you shall he be to you, the

stranger that lives among you. And you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt; I am the L-rd your G-d.

As the home-born - It was taught: A convert who took upon himself all of the Torah except for one thing — even an inference of the Scribes — is not to be accepted. Why so? For it is written: "As the home-born" — just as the home-born accept everything, so the convert must accept everything (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁵⁹

for you were strangers - It was taught: R. Nathan says: Do not cast up your own defect to others, as it is written: "for you were strangers" (Bava Metzia 59b).²⁶⁰

19:35 You shall not do wrong in judgment: in meteyard, in weight, or in measure.

You shall not do wrong in judgment - To whom is this directed? If to a judge, it is already written (see *Ibid*. 15). It is to teach us, rather, that a merchant is called a "judge," and if he falsifies in measurement, he is called: "wrong," "hated," "revolting," "rejected," "abominable" (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁶¹

in meteyard, in weight, or in measure - The Rabbis taught: "in meteyard" — this is land measure, that he not measure for one in dry season and for another in rainy season; "in weight" — that he not dip his weights in salt [which makes them heavier]; "or in measure" — that he not pour out liquid so that it foams [in which instance the buyer does not receive the full amount] (Bava Metzia 61b). 262-264

19:36 Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall you have; I am the L-rd your G-d, who brought you out of the land of Egypt.

and a just hin - What is the intent of: "and a just hin"? Was not "hin" in the category of: "a just ephah" [Why, then, was it singled out?] To teach that your "Yes" ["hehn" (similar to "hin")] should be just and that your "No" should be just (Ibid. 49b).²⁶⁵

shall you have - From here the sages derived: Every *mitzvah* whose reward is [stated] at its side, *beth-din* is not punished for it [i.e., for failure to insure its observance, the [stated] reward itself sufficing as an incentive] (*Yerushalmi Bava Bathra* 5:5).²⁶⁶

who brought, etc. - Rava said: Why does Scripture mention the exodus from Egypt in connection with weights? The Holy One Blessed be He is saying [as it were]: "I am He who distinguished in Egypt between the drop of the first-born and the drop which was not of the first-born; I am He who is destined to exact payment from him who dips his weights in salt" [to make them heavier] (Bava Metzia 61b). 267

who brought, etc. - on condition that you take upon yourselves the *mitzvah* of measures; for all who acknowledge the *mitzvah* of measures acknowledge [in principle (see above)] the exodus from Egypt, and all who deny the *mitzvah* of measures deny the exodus from Egypt (*Torath Cohanim*). ²⁶⁸

- 19:37 And you shall heed all of My statutes and all of My judgments, and you shall do them; I am the L-rd.
- 20:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 20:2 And to the children of Israel you shall say: A man, a man of the children of Israel and of the stranger who sojourns in Israel, who gives of his seed to the Molech, he shall die; the people of the land shall stone him with stones.

A man, a man - What is the intent of: "A man, a man"? To include gentiles as exhorted against idolatry, as Jews are (Chagigah 11b).

who gives of his seed to the Molech - see commentary on 18:21

the people of the land shall stone him - This teaches us that if beth-din cannot do so by itself, the people of the land assist in killing him (Torath Cohanim).²

20:3 And I will set My face against that man, and I will cut him off from the midst of his people; for of his seed he has given to the Molech, to defile My sanctuary and to profane My holy name.

against that man - that man, and not one who transgresses under constraint, inadvertently, or mistakenly (*Ibid.*).³

for of his seed - What is the intent of this? Since it is written (Deuteronomy 18:10): "Let there not be found one who passes his son or his daughter through fire," I might think that this applies specifically to his son or his daughter. Whence do I derive that it applies likewise to his son's or daughter's son? From: "for of his seed he has given" (Sanhedrin 64b).4

20:4 And if the people of the land avert, avert their eyes from that man when he gives of his seed to the Molech, not to kill him.

And if ... avert, avert - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if they avert their eyes in one thing, they are destined to avert it in many things, and that if they avert them in respect to one beth-din, they are destined to avert them in respect to many — up to the Great Sanhedrin? From: "And if ... avert, avert" (Torath Cohanim).

when he gives of his seed - This tells me only of legitimate seed. Whence do I derive the same for illegitimate seed? From: "when he gives of his seed" — any seed (Sanhedrin 64b).6

20:5 And I shall set My face against that man and against his family, and I shall cut off him and all who stray after him, to stray after the Molech, from the midst of their people.

and against his family - It was taught: R. Shimon said: If he sinned, how has his family sinned? We are being taught, however, that there is no family with a tax-gouger, where all are not tax-gougers; where there is a thief, where all are not thieves — for they support and cover-up for him (Shevuoth 39a).

and I shall cut off - It was taught: With the demise of the Sanhedrin came the demise of song in the houses of feasting. What does one have to do with the other? It is written: "And if the people of the land avert, avert their eyes, etc., then I shall set My face against that man and against his family" [whereas when the Sanhedrin officiated, they did not "avert their eyes," so that families were spared such retribution and the houses of feasting could resound with song unalloyed by sorrow] (Yerushalmi Sotah 9:12).8

and I shall cut off - It was taught: R. Nechunia b. Hakaneh equated Yom Kippur with Sabbath for purposes of [exemption from monetary] payment [attendant upon the performance of a labor prohibited on that day]. Why so? Rava said: It is written: "And if the people of the land avert, avert, etc., then I shall set My face against that man... and I shall cut him off." Scripture is hereby stating: "My cutting-off is comparable to your death penalty. Just as your death penalty exempts [him who is to die] from monetary payment, so My cutting-off exempts from monetary payment" (Kethuvoth 30b). 9,10

and I shall cut him off - It was taught: Rebbi says: What is the intent of "him" [emphatic in the Hebrew]? Because it is written: "And I shall set My face against that man and against his family," I might think that the entire family is to be cut off; it is, therefore, written: "and I shall cut him off" — he is to be cut off, but not his family (Shevuoth 39a)."

20:6 And the soul that turns to the *ovoth* and to the *yidonim* to stray after them — I shall set My face against that soul, and I shall cut him off from the midst of his people.

to stray after them - to include the other varieties of idol worship in the interdict of kareth [cutting-off] (Torath Cohanim).¹²

20:7 And you shall sanctify yourselves and you shall be holy; for I am the L-rd your G-d.

And you shall sanctify yourselves - see commentary on 11:44

20:8 And you shall heed My statutes and do them; I am the L-rd who makes you holy.

20:9 For a man, a man, who curses his father and his mother shall be put to death. He has cursed his father and his mother; his blood is in him.

a man, a man - The Rabbis taught: "A man" [would suffice]. What is the intent of: "a man, a man"? To include a tumtum [one whose sex is in doubt] and a hermaphrodite (Sanhedrin 66a).¹³

his father and his mother - This tells me only of his father and his mother. Whence do I derive the same [halachah] for [one who curses] his father without [cursing] his mother, or his mother without his father? R. Yonathan said: [Wherever "eth"-"ve-eth" are written (as they are here: "eth aviv ve-eth imo" - "his father and his mother")] the reference is to both together or to each by itself unless Scripture explicitly states that both are required (Ibid.).14

his father and his mother - his father, and not his father's father; his mother, and not his mother's father (Torath Cohanim).¹⁵

his father and his mother - "his father," of a certainty; and "his mother," of a certainty, and not one of whom he is in doubt (*Ibid.*). 16

shall be put to death - by stoning. Why not by one of the other death penalties mentioned in scripture? It is written here: "his blood is in him," and, in respect to ov and yidoni (27): "Their blood is in them." Just as there, the penalty is stoning; here, too, it is stoning (Sanhedrin 66a).¹⁷

He has cursed his father and his mother - The Rabbis taught: I might think, since there is liability both for striking and for cursing, that just as there is liability for striking only in the lifetime of the parent, so there is liability for cursing only in his lifetime; it is, therefore, written: "He has cursed his father and his mother" — even after their death (*Ibid.* 85b). 18,19

20:10 And a man who lives with another man's wife, who lives with the wife of his neighbor — they shall be put to death, the adulterer and the adulteress.

And a man, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "a man" — to exclude a minor;

"who lives with another man's wife" — to exclude the wife of a minor (*Ibid.* 52b).^{20,21}

the wife of his neighbor - to exclude the wife of others [i.e., idolators] (*Ibid.*).²²

they shall be put to death - by strangulation. Why not by one of the other death penalties mentioned in Scripture? "Death" is written both in respect to death at the hands of Heaven and death at the hands of man. Just as death at the hands of Heaven leaves no outward sign [on the body, if G-d so wills it], so death at the hands of man [that referred to here, is the type that] leaves no outward sign [And which is that? Strangulation] (Ibid.).^{23,24}

20:11 And a man who lies with his father's wife, he has revealed the nakedness of his father. Both of them shall die; their blood is in them.

shall die - by stoning. Why not by one of the other death penalties mentioned in Scripture? It is written here: "their blood is in them," and, in respect to ov and yidoni (27): "Their blood is in them." Just as there, the penalty is stoning; here, too, it is stoning (*Ibid.* 54a).²⁵

- 20:12 And if a man lies with his daughter-in-law, both of them shall be put to death. They have wrought corruption; their blood is in them.
- 20:13 And if a man lies with a male, the lyings of a woman, an abomination has been wrought by both of them. They shall be put to death; their blood is in them.

And a man, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "a man" — to exclude a minor; "who lies with a male" — whether adult or minor; "the lyings of a woman" — Scripture teaches us that there are two lyings in a woman [normative and sodomic; for halachic purposes they are both considered "lying"]. R. Yishmael said: This came to teach [something

about lying with a male] and ended up being taught [something about lying with a female] (Ibid.).²⁶⁻²⁸

the lyings of a woman - see commentary on 18:22

20:14 And if a man takes a woman and her mother, it is lewdness. In fire shall they be burned, he and they, and there shall not be lewdness in your midst.

a woman and her mother - This tells me only of a woman and her mother. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the halachah] her daughter, the daughter of her daughter, and the daughter of her son? It is written here: "lewdness," and, elsewhere (18:17): "it is lewdness" — Just as there, her daughter, her daughter's daughter, and her son's daughter; here, too, her daughter, her daughter's daughter, and her son's daughter (*Ibid.* 75a).²⁹

it is lewdness - Whence is it derived that males are like females [in this regard; i.e., that his progeny outside of wedlock (his daughter, his daughter's daughter, and his son's daughter) are like hers [the progeny of his wife by marriage (as derived from the world "lewdness" [see above])]? It is written here: "lewdness," and, elsewhere (18:17): "lewdness" — Just as there, males are like females [in this regard]; here, too, males are like females (Ibid.). 30,31

it is lewdness - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that the lower [i.e., more distant kin — his father-in-law's mother and his mother-in-law's mother] are as the higher [i.e., closer kin — his mother-in-law — in this regard]? It is written here: "lewdness," and, elsewhere (18:17): "lewdness" — Just as there, the lower [i.e., her daughter's daughter and her son's daughter] are as the higher [i.e., her own daughter]; here, too, the lower are as the higher (*Ibid.* 76b). 32,33

he and they - The Rabbis taught: "he and they" — he and both of them — when they are both alive. Therefore, his mother-in-law, after the death of his wife, is [interdicted by] a prohibition in general [i.e., not of the same degree of stringency as the above] (*Ibid.* 76b).³⁴

20:15 And if a man gives his lying to a beast, he shall be put to death, and the beast you shall kill.

And if a man, etc. - It was taught: "a man" — to exclude a minor; "gives his lying to a beast" — full grown or not (*Ibid.* 54b). 35

he shall be put to death - by stoning. Why not by one of the other death penalties mentioned in Scripture? It is written here: "and the beast you shall kill," and, in respect to an enticer [to idolatry] (*Deuteronomy* 13:10): "You shall surely kill him" — Just as there, by stoning; here, too, by stoning (*Ibid.*).³⁶

and the beast you shall kill - The active and the passive participants are judged by twenty-three judges; for it is written (16): "you shall kill the woman and the beast" [the beast (active in this case) being likened to the woman, who requires twenty-three judges], and (here): "and the beast [passive in this case] you shall kill" (*Ibid.* 2a).³⁷

and the beast you shall kill - If the man sinned, how did the beast sin? Because a man was "undone" by it, Scripture commands it to be killed. Or — so that the beast not walk through the market and people say: "This is the one for which that man was stoned" (*Ibid.* 54b).³⁸

20:16 And a woman who comes to any beast so that it mount her, you shall kill the woman and the beast. They shall die; their blood is in them.

They shall die - by stoning. Why not by one of the other death penalties mentioned in Scripture? [It is written here: "their blood is in them," and, in respect to ov and yidoni (27): "Their blood is in them." Just as there, the penalty is stoning; here, too, it is stoning] (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 7:7).³⁹

20:17 And a man who takes his sister, the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother, and sees her nakedness, and she sees his nakedness, it is shameful. And they shall be cut off before the eyes of the children of their people. The

nakedness of his sister he has revealed; he shall bear his sin.

who takes his sister...and they shall be cut off - It was taught: "his sister" was in the class of all the illicit relations. Why was it singled out for special mention as punishable by cutting-off? To require [three] distinct [sin-offerings for one who unintentionally lived with] his sister, who was also his father's sister and his mother's sister (Krituth 2b).40

and sees her nakedness - Ulla said: Whence is the necessity for fore-warning derived in Scripture? From: "And a man who takes his sister... and sees her nakedness." Is "seeing" the problem? [The meaning is, rather,] that he must be made to see [by fore-warning] the nature of the prohibition. And if this cannot apply to cutting-off [the purpose of fore-warning essentially being to permit the beth-din to punish him as a deliberate violator, whereas cutting-off is a Heavenly punishment, which, obviously, requires no probing of intention], learn it as applying to the administration of stripes (Sanhedrin 40b). 41,42

it is shameful [chesed] - What is the intent of "chesed" [generally, "lovingkindness"]? R. Avin answered: That one not object: "But did not Cain and Abel marry their sisters?" That was a special act of lovingkindness which I [the L-rd] performed for the first men, that the world might be built up from them, as it is written (Psalms 89:3): "For I said: 'The world shall be built by lovingkindness'" (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 11:1).43

The nakedness of his sister he has revealed - What is the intent of this? If he is punished for the daughter of his father who is not the daughter of his mother, and for the daughter of his mother who is not the daughter of his father, how much more so for the daughter of both his father and his mother! [Why tell us this, then?] We are hereby taught that punishments are not derived from a fortiori arguments (Makkoth 5b).44

20:18 And a man who lies with a woman in her flow and reveals her nakedness — he has bared her fountain and she has revealed the fountain of her blood; and both of them shall be cut off from the midst of their people.

And a man - to exclude a minor (Torath Cohanim).45

a woman in her flow - "flow" refers to menstruation, as it is written (15:33): "and she that flows her menstrual flow" (*Ibid.*).46

a woman in her flow, etc. - This teaches us that a woman is not menstrually unclean unless the flow comes from her womb (Niddah 41b).⁴⁷

he has bared her fountain - Ulla said: Whence is it derived that peripheral [non-consummated] intercourse ["he'arah"] is forbidden by Scripture? It is written: "And a man who lies...he has bared her fountain." From here it is derived that peripheral intercourse is forbidden by the Torah [it being referred to as "lying," the conventional term for intercourse] (Yevamoth 54a).48

20:19 And the nakedness of the sister of your mother and the sister of your father you shall not reveal. For he has bared his kin; they shall bear their sin.

the sister of your mother, etc. - the sister of your mother, both from the father or from the mother; and the sister of your father, both from the father or from the mother (*Ibid.* b).⁴⁹

For he has bared his kin - Ravina said to Rava: What is the halachah with respect to he'arah [peripheral, non-consummated intercourse] with a beast? He answered: It is written: "For he has bared ["he'arah"] his kin." If this is not needed to tell us of he'arah with the sister of his father or the sister of his mother [this already being derived from niddah], learn it as applying to he'arah with a beast (Sanhedrin 55a).

20:20 And a man who lies with his uncle's wife, the nakedness of his uncle he has revealed. They shall bear their sin; they shall die childless.

his uncle's wife - [his uncle] from the father, but not from the mother. Why so? It is derived [by deduction] from: "his uncle"-"his uncle." It is written here: "the nakedness of his uncle he has revealed," and, elsewhere (25:49): "or his uncle or the son of his uncle may redeem

him" — Just as there, [his uncle] from the father, and not from the mother; here, too, [his uncle] from the father, and not from the mother (Yevamoth 54b).⁵¹

they shall die childless - Rabbah asked: It is written: "they shall die childless," and (21): "they shall be childless." How is this to be reconciled? If he has children, he buries them; if he does not have children, he reamins childless (*Ibid.* 55a).⁵²

20:21 And a man who takes the wife of his brother, she is *niddah*. He has revealed the nakedness of his brother; they shall be childless.

who takes the wife of his brother - Scripture is speaking of the wife of his brother from his father. [But] perhaps even the wife of his brother from his mother is intended! It is, therefore, written: "she is niddah" [generally, "menstrually unclean"]. [Now is the wife of one's brother niddah?] The meaning is, rather, that she is like a niddah. Just as a niddah is sometimes forbidden [i.e., during her niddah period] and sometimes permitted [i.e., when she is clean], so the wife of the brother [referred to here] is at a certain period [i.e., during her marriage] forbidden, and, at a certain period [i.e., upon the death of her husband] permitted. And which is this? The wife of his brother from his father (Torath Cohanim).⁵³

she is niddah - Now is the wife of his brother niddah? The meaning is, rather, that she is like a niddah. Just as a niddah, though she is subsequently [i.e., after her niddah period] permitted, still, while she is forbidden, living with her entails the penalty of kareth; so, the wife of his brother, though she is subsequently [i.e., upon her husband's death] permitted by levirate marriage; still, in the life-time of her husband, living with her entails the penalty of kareth (Yevamoth 54b).⁵⁴

20:22 And you shall heed all of My statutes and all of My judgments, and you shall do them; and the land will not vomit you out, whither I bring you, to dwell in it.

- 20:23 And you shall not walk in the statutes of the nation which I am sending away before you. For all of these they did, and I despised them.
- and I despised them as a man who despises his food (Torath Cohanim). 55
- 20:24 And I said to you: You shall inherit their land, and I will give it to you to inherit it, a land which flows milk and honey. I am the L-rd your G-d who separated you from the peoples.
- 20:25 And you shall separate between the clean beast and the unclean, and between the unclean fowl and the clean; and you shall not make yourselves disgusting through the beast or the fowl, or through anything with which the ground swarms, which I have separated for you as unclean.

And you shall separate, etc. - R. Yossi b. R. Chanina taught before R. Yochanan: "And you shall separate between the clean beast and the unclean, and between the unclean fowl and the clean; and you shall not make yourselves disgusting through the beast or the fowl, or through anything with which the ground swarms, which I have separated for you as unclean." Scripture begins with eating and ends with cleanliness — to teach that just as the size which produces uncleanliness is that of a lentil, so the size [for transgression] in eating is that of a lentil (Me'ilah 16b). 56,57

And you shall separate, etc. - "between the clean beast and the unclean" — between that which is clean for you and that which is unclean for you — between the severing of the majority of the windpipe [in which case the animal is kasher] and the severing of half [in which case it is treifah] (Torath Cohanim). 58

20:26 And you shall be holy to Me, for I, the L-rd, am holy; and

I have set you apart from the peoples to be unto Me.

and I have set you apart, etc. - It was taught: R. Elazar b. Azaryah says: Whence is it derived that a man should not say: I do not desire to eat the flesh of a pig; I do not desire to live with the forbidden relations, [but that he should say:] I do desire it, but what can I do? My Father in heaven has decreed against it! It is derived from: "and I have set you apart from the peoples to be unto Me" (Ibid.). 59

20:27 And a man or a woman, if there be in them an ov or yidoni, they shall be put to death. With stones they shall stone them; their blood is in them.

And a man or a woman - This tells me only of a man or a woman. Whence do I derive [the same halachah for] a tumtum [one of indeterminate sex] and a hermaphrodite? From: "or a woman" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Ibid.). 60

their blood is in them - This is the archetype for all "their blood is in them" mentioned in Scripture as referring to death by stoning (*Ibid.*).⁶¹

Emor

21:1 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying: Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, and you shall say to them: For a dead body he shall not become unclean among his people.

Speak to the priests - It was taught: The daughter of a priest is permitted to leave Eretz Yisrael [though a priest himself is forbidden to do so because of the laxity of the observance of the laws of cleanliness outside the land]. Why so? For it is written: "Speak to the priests" [charging them with the laws of cleanliness], but not to the daughter of a priest (Yerushalmi Sotah 3:7).1

to the priests - to [bona fide] priests, and not to challalim [those of imperfect priestly status] (Torath Cohanim).²

the sons of Aaron - It was taught: I might think that Israelites are exhorted against contact with a carcass; it is, therefore, written: "Speak to the priests, and the sons of Aaron... For a dead [human] body he shall not become unclean" — the sons of Aaron are so exhorted, but not Jews in general. And if they are not exhorted in respect to the more stringent uncleanliness [that of a human body], how much more so are they not exhorted in respect to the less stringent variety [that of an animal carcass]? (Rosh Hashanah 16b).

the sons of Aaron - The daughter of a priest may become unclean for a dead body. Why so? It is written: "Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron" — "the sons of Aaron," but not the daughters of Aaron (Sotah 23b).4

the sons of Aaron - "the sons of Aaron" — to include those with blemishes (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵

and you shall say to them - "Speak ... and you shall say to them" — What is the intent of this [repetition]? To exhort the elders in respect to

minors, not to cause them to become unclean (Yevamoth 114a).6

For a dead body he shall not become unclean - "For a dead body" — to include blood and portions of uncleanliness [size] detached from a dead body (*Ibid.*).

he shall not become unclean - It is written here: "he shall not become unclean," and, in respect to a high priest (11): "he shall not become unclean." Just as the high priest is liable for (*Ibid.*): "he shall not enter" [the "tent" of the dead] and for: "he shall not become unclean," here, too, "he shall not become unclean" stated in respect to a regular priest includes liability for entering and for becoming unclean (*Ibid.*).8

he shall not become unclean among his people - When his people are there [i.e., when there are non-priests who can tend to the body], he is not to become unclean, but he is to become unclean for a meth mitzvah [a body which has no one to tend to it] (Ibid.).9

Only for his flesh that is near to him, his mother and his father, his son and his daughter and his brother.

Only for his flesh - "his flesh" — this is his wife. Yet it is written (4): "Let a husband [who is a priest] not become unclean [for his wife] among his people to become profaned"! [The reconciliation is that] there is a husband that may become unclean and one that may not become unclean. How so? He may become unclean for his wife if she were [halachically] fit [to be married to him], and he may not become unclean for his wife if she were unfit (Yevamoth 22b). 10

that is near to him - "that is near" — to exclude one that was betrothed to him; "to him" — to exclude one that he divorced (Torath Cohanim).¹¹

his mother - even if she became profaned [vis à vis the priesthood] (*Ibid.*).¹²

and his father - even one reputed [though not definitely ascertained] to be his father (Ibid.). 13

and his father - when he [i.e., the body] is whole, and not when non-intact (*Ibid.*).¹⁴

and his son and his daughter - even those who are [halachically] unfit, except for his son and daughter from a maidservant or from a gentile woman [for whom he is not permitted to become unclean] (Yevamoth 22b).¹⁵

and his son and his daughter - his viable son and daughter, to exclude those who were [halachically] non-viable (Torath Cohanim).¹⁶

and his brother - "his brother," whether fit or unfit (Ibid.).17

and his brother - his paternal, but not his maternal brother (Ibid.).18

21:3 And for his sister, the virgin, who is near to him, who was not wed to a man — for her he shall make himself unclean.

And for his sister - "his sister," whether fit or unfit (Ibid.). 19

And for his sister - his paternal, but not his maternal sister (Ibid.).20

And for his sister, the virgin - "the virgin" — to exclude one who was forced or seduced. I might think that I exclude one whose hymen was accidentally ruptured; it is, therefore, written: "who was not possessed by a man" — [the implication being] one who lost her virginity through possession by a man, and not through other causes (Yevamoth 60a).²¹

who is near to him - "who is near" — to include one who was betrothed and divorced; "to him" — to include a bogereth [one whose virginal signs were partially lost in the process of maturing] (Ibid.).²²

who was not wed [hayethah] to a man - to exclude one who was betrothed ["betrothal" and "marriage" being subsumed under the same term ("havayah") in the Hebrew] (Ibid.).²³

for her he shall make himself unclean - "for her he shall make himself unclean," and not for her [discrete] limbs [see above, commentary (14)] (Nazir 43b).²⁴

for her he shall make himself unclean - It is a mitzvah. If he demurs, he is forced to become unclean for her (Zevachim 100a).²⁵

for her he shall make himself unclean - He makes himself unclean where there is certainty [i.e., that she is his sister], but not where there is doubt (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁶

for her he shall make himself unclean - "for her he shall make himself unclean," but he shall not make himself unclean for others [who are not his kin], with her [i.e., once he has made himself unclean for her] (*Ibid.*).²⁷

- 21:4 Let a husband [who is a priest] not become unclean [for his wife] among his people to become profaned.
- a husband among his people When they [(his kin, though they be unfit halachically in terms of family relationship)] do the "deeds of his people" [i.e., are observant Jews, he may become unclean for them], but not when they deviate from the ways of his people (*Ibid.*).²⁸
- to become profaned [i.e., He is permitted to come in contact with him] until the time of death [the root of "corpse" and "profane" being the same ("challal")] (Nazir 43a).²⁹
- to become profaned [Scripture is speaking of] one who is not profaned [to begin with], to exclude [from the prohibition against becoming unclean for non-kin] one who is already profaning himself [by becoming unclean for his kin] (*Ibid.* b).³⁰
- 21:5 They shall not make a baldness upon their head, and the corners of their beard they shall not shave off, and in their flesh they shall not make any cutting.

They shall not make a baldness - It is written here: "baldness," and, elsewhere (*Deuteronomy* 14:1): "and do not make baldness between your eyes for the dead." Just as there, for the dead; here, too, for the dead (*Makkoth* 20a).³¹

a baldness upon their head - The Rabbis taught: I might think that even

if he made four or five bald spots he would be liable for one alone; it is, therefore, written: "a baldness," to stipulate liability for each one individually (*Ibid.*).³²

a bald spot upon their head - What is the intent of: "upon their head"? Because it is written (*Deuteronomy* 14:1): "and do not make baldness between your eyes," I might think that only "between the eyes" entails liability; it is, therefore, written: "upon their head" — to include all of the head (*Ibid.*).^{33,34}

they shall not shave off - The Rabbis taught: I might think that even cutting off with a scissors makes him liable; it is, therefore, written (19:27): "do not destroy the corners of your beard." If [it were written only]: "do not destroy," I might think that if he plucked the hairs with a tweezer or a depilatory, he would be liable; it is, therefore, written: "they shall not shave off." What is being referred to? Shaving that "destroys," e.g., shaving with a razor (*Ibid.* 21a).³⁵

they shall not make any cutting - It is written here: "cutting," and, elsewhere (19:28): "And a cutting for a person..." Just as there, for one who is dead; here, too, for one who is dead (*Torath Cohanim*). 36

they shall not make any cutting - I might think that if he made five lacerations he would be liable only for one; it is, therefore, written: "cutting," to make him liable for each cutting (*Torath Cohanim*).³⁷

21:6 Holy shall they be to their G-d, and they shall not profane the name of their G-d; for the fire-offerings of the L-rd, the bread of their G-d, they offer up — and they shall be holy.

Holy shall they be - A general rule was stated in respect to levirate marriage, viz.: All who are forbidden because of "holiness" perform the chalitzah ceremony, but do not enter into levirate marriage. And who is forbidden because of "holiness"? A widow [falling, for levirate marriage,] to a high-priest, one who had been divorced or who had received chalitzah falling to a regular priest, a mamzereth [the issue of a forbidden union] and a Nethinah [a descendant of the Gibeonites] falling to an Israelite, and the daughter of an Israelite falling to a Nathin

366

or a mamzer. Why are they referred to as prohibitions of "holiness"? Because it is written: "Holy shall they be" (Yevamoth 20a). 38,39

and they shall not profane - It was taught: R. Samai says: Where is it intimated that a priest who had immersed himself [for his uncleanliness] in the daytime and officiated in the priestly service [before the sun had set] — where is it intimated that he is guilty of profanation? From: "Holy shall they be... and they shall not profane." If this is not needed for one who officiated in a state of uncleanliness [that halachah being stated elsewhere], understand it as applying to one who officiated after immersing in the daytime. And it is derived: "profanation" (here) - "profanation" in respect to [a priest, who had immersed in the daytime, eating | terumah. Just as there, the penalty is death; here, too, it is death (Sanhedrin 83b).40-42

they offer up - they, and not the Levites (Torath Cohanim).43

and they shall be holy - to include those with defects as remaining in a state of holiness (Sanhedrin 51b).44

21:7 A woman who is a zonah and one who has been profaned they shall not take, and a woman divorced from her husband they shall not take; for he is holy to his G-d.

A woman who is a zonah - A "zonah" [in this instance] is a convert, a freed maidservant, or one who had been lived with unlawfully [i.e., in the context of the forbidden relations] (Yevamoth 81a).45

and one who has been profaned [challalah] - What is "challalah"? One that is born of a relationship forbidden to a priest [such as the daughter of a divorced woman and a priest (Kiddushin 77a).46

they shall not take - even through he'arah [peripheral, nonconsummated intercourse]. Whence is this derived: From: "taking" (here) - "taking" in respect to forbidden relationships punishable by cutting-off [where he'arah is equivalent to consummated intercourse] (Yevamoth 54a).47

they shall not take - It is written: "lo yikechu" ("they shall not take") and pronounced: "lo yikachu" ("they shall not be taken"), which teaches us that the woman is exhorted by way of the exhortation to the man (*Ibid.* 84b).⁴⁸

and a woman divorced - whether she were betrothed or married (*Ibid.* 59a). 49

and a woman divorced - This tells me only of one who was divorced. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the prohibition] one who received chalitzah? From: "and a woman." I might think that the rival [tzarah] of one who had received chalitzah is as the latter [in being prohibited]; it is, therefore, written: "and a woman divorced from her husband" — one whose divorce is by way of her husband; to exclude the rival of a chalutzah, whose "divorce" is not by way of the husband [but by reason of her being forbidden to his brother] (Torath Cohanim). 50

divorced from her husband - If he handed her a writ of divorce and said to her: "You are divorced from me, but not permitted to any man," she is rendered unfit for the priesthood [though such a divorce is, otherwise, invalid]; for it is written: "and a woman divorced from her husband" — even if she were divorced only from her husband, they shall not take her (Yevamoth 52a).51

divorced from her husband - If she were told that her husband had died and she was betrothed to another — after which her husband returned; though the second had given her a divorce, she is not thereby rendered unfit for the priesthood, for it is written: "and a woman divorced from her husband" — from her husband, but not from one who was not her husband (*Ibid.* 92a).⁵²

21:8 And you shall make him holy, for he offers up the bread of your G-d; holy shall he be to you, for holy am I the L-rd, who sanctifies you.

And you shall make him holy - It was taught: [Whence is it derived that a priest who married one who was unfit for him and refused to divorce her] should be forced to do so? From: "And you shall make him holy" — [even] against his will (*Ibid.* 88b).⁵³

And you shall make him holy - It was taught in the school of R.

Yishmael: "And you shall make him holy"—in all matters of holiness: to be the first in initiating them, to be the first in making the benediction, and to be the first in taking the choicest share (Gittin 59b).⁵⁴

And the daughter of a man who is a priest, if she profane herself through fornication, she profanes her father; in fire she shall be burned.

And the daughter of a man who is a priest - to include a betrothed and married maiden, a betrothed and married bogereth [a matured maid], even one who has become old (Sanhedrin 50b).⁵⁵

And the daughter of a man who is a priest - This tells me only of one who is married to a priest. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the halachah] one who is married to a Levite, an Israelite, an idolator, a challal [one who is profaned vis à vis the priesthood], a mamzer, and a Nathin? From: "And the daughter of a man who is a priest" — though she herself not be married to a priest (Ibid. 51a).³⁶

if she profane herself through fornication - I might think [the halachah applied] even if she profaned the Sabbath; it is, therefore, written: "if she profane herself through fornication" — Scripture is referring to the profanation of adultery (*Ibid.* 50b).⁵⁷

her father [lit., "with her father"] - [When she is with her father (i.e., betrothed but not yet married], she is stoned; and when she is with her father-in-law (i.e., married), she is burned] (Ibid. 51b). 58

her father - I might think [the halachah applied] even if she were single. [This is counter-indicated by the following:] It is written here: "her father," and, in respect to a betrothed maiden (Deuteronomy 22:21): "her father." Just as there, the reference is to fornication within the context of marital ties; here, too, the reference is to fornication within the context of marital ties (Ibid.).⁵⁹

her father, etc. - It was taught: R. Meir says: What is the intent of: "she profanes her father"? If [heretofore, before her adulterous act] they had been treating him as holy, they now treat him in a commonplace

manner; if they had been according him honor, they now deport themselves demeaningly towards him. They say: "Cursed is he who begot one such as she; cursed is he who raised her; cursed is he from whose loins she issued" (*Ibid.* 52a).60

in fire she shall be burned - She is to be burned, but not her consort; she is to be burned, but not [foiled] witnesses who scheme [to have her burned] (Ibid. 51a).⁶¹

in fire she shall be burned - [How is she burned?] R. Mathnah said: They made a bar of [molten] lead for her [which she swallowed]. Why was she not burned by surrounding her with vine-rods and igniting them? It is derived: "burning" [here] - "burning," in respect to [the death of] the sons of Aaron. Just as there, the soul [i.e., the "life"] was burned and the body remained intact; here, too, the soul is burned and the body remains intact (*Pesachim* 75a).⁶²

21:10 And the priest who is greater than his brothers, upon whose head the oil of anointment has been poured, and who has been consecrated to wear the garments — his hair he shall not dishevel and his clothes he shall not rend.

And the priest - The Rabbis taught: "And the priest who is greater than his brothers" — this is the high-priest; "upon whose head the oil of anointment has been poured" — this is the priest anointed for war; "and who has been consecrated to wear the garments" — this is the priest of the many garments. Of all, it is stated: "his hair he shall not dishevel and his clothes he shall not rend, and to any dead body he shall not come" (Horiyoth 12b).63

And the priest who is greater than his brothers - He should be greater than his brothers in strength, beauty, wisdom, and wealth. Others say: Whence is it derived that if he is lacking these attributes, his brother priests are to elevate him? From: "And the priest who is greater than [lit., "from"] his brothers" — his greatness should come from his brothers (Yoma 19a).64

and his clothes he shall not rend - What is the intent of: "he shall not rend"? He does not rend his clothes [in mourning] as others do. He

rends them below, whereas a non-priest rends them above (Horiyoth 12b).65

21:11 And to any dead body he shall not come. For his father and for his mother he shall not become unclean.

And to any dead body - It was taught: A fourth of a log of blood issuing from two dead bodies is clean, not producing dead-body uncleanliness in a tent, it being written: "And to any dead body he shall not come" — "nafshath" [lit., one dead body] is written [i.e., all of the fourth must come from one body in order for uncleanliness to be produced] (Sanhedrin 4a).66

he shall not come - "he shall not come" and "he shall not become unclean" — He is exhorted against becoming unclean [by contact with the body] and against entering [the "tent" of the dead] (Nazir 42b).⁶⁷

For his father - "For his father" he does not become unclean, but he does become unclean for a meth mitzvah [a dead body that has no one to attend it] (Ibid. 47b).⁶⁸

and for his mother - It is written: "his mother" in respect to a Nazirite, and, "his mother," in respect to a high-priest. Just as with a Nazirite, it is in their [his parents'] death that he does not become unclean for them, but he does become unclean for their leprous plague-spot and their zav discharge, so, with the high-priest, it is in their death that he does not become unclean for them, but he does become unclean for their leprous plague-spot and their zav discharge (Ibid. 48a).⁶⁹

21:12 And from the sanctuary he shall not go out, and he shall not profane the sanctuary of his G-d; for the consecration of the anointing oil of his G-d is upon him; I am the L-rd.

And from the sanctuary he shall not go out - If one of his kin died, he does not follow the hearse, it being written: "And from the sanctuary he shall not go out" (Sanhedrin 18a).⁷⁰

he shall not go out - [From here it is derived that a high-priest offers sacrifices while he is a mourner] (Zevachim 99a, see Rashi).⁷¹

he shall not go out and he shall not profane - All sacrifices whose blood was received by a priest in mourning are invalidated. Whence is this derived? From: "And from the sanctuary he shall not go out and he shall not profane" — he [the high-priest], if he does not go out [to follow the hearse] does not profane [the sacrificial service], but another [i.e., a regular priest], if he does not go out, does profane (*Ibid.* 16a).

and he shall not profane - It was taught: If a priest was carrying a dead body on his shoulders and he were handed his dead [i.e., the body of a kinsman] or the body of another, and he touched it, I might think that he became liable — it is, therefore, written: "and he shall not profane," to exclude one who is already profaning himself [by becoming unclean for his kin] (Nazir 42b).⁷³

the anointing oil of his G-d is upon him - I might think that just as the high-priest sacrifices when he is in mourning the priest anointed for war also sacrifices when he is in mourning; it is, therefore, written: "for the consecration of the anointing oil of his G-d is upon him" — it is upon him, and not upon his neighbor [i.e., the priest anointed for war] (Horiyoth 12b).74

the anointing oil of his G-d is upon him - A high-priest who sinned is given stripes, but he is not deposed from his high station. R. Mana said: It is written: "for the consecration of the anointing oil of his G-d is upon him; I am the L-rd" — as if to say: "Just as I retain My holiness, so Aaron retains his" (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 2:1).75

21:13 And he, a woman in her virginity he shall take.

And he - Both an officiating high-priest and one who has passed from the high-priesthood are commanded in respect to a virgin. This tells me only of one who passed from it because of a seminal emission. Whence do I derive the same [halachah] for one who passed from it because of a blemish? From: "And he" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Horiyoth 12b). 76

And he - to include the priest anointed for war as commanded in respect to a virgin (*Ibid.*). 77

And he - "he," and not the king; "he," and not a Nazirite (Yerushalmi Horiyoth 3:2).78

- a woman "a woman" one, and not two (Yevamoth 59a).79
- a woman in her virginity to exclude a bogereth whose virginal signs were partially lost [in the process of maturing] (Ibid.).80
- a woman in her virginity he shall take The Rabbis taught: If a highpriest betrothed a minor and she became a bogereth during the period of her betrothal, he may not wed her. Why so? For it is written: "a woman in her virginity he shall take"; it is the "taking" of marriage [and not that of betrothal] which is the determining factor (Yevamoth 59a).⁸¹
- 21:14 A widow, and a divorced woman, and a challalah and a zonah [see commentary on 21:7] these he shall not take; but only a virgin from his people shall he take as a wife.

A widow and a divorced woman - A widow, similar to a divorced woman. Just as he is forbidden to take a divorced woman, whether she were betrothed or married, so he is forbidden to take a widow, whether she were betrothed or married (*Ibid.*). 82

A widow, and a divorced woman, etc. - The Rabbis taught: A widow, a widow, a widow [i.e., if he took a woman who had been widowed three times]; a divorced woman, a divorced woman, a divorced woman, he incurs only one liability [and not three]. [If he took a woman who were] a widow, a divorced woman, a challalah, a zonah, in that order, he is liable for each transgression. [However,] if she were first a zonah, then a challalah, then divorced, and then widowed, he incurs only one liability [the succeeding states adding no new prohibitions to those already implicit in the state of zonah] (Kiddushin 77a). 83,84

and a divorced woman - Why mention a divorced woman in respect to a high-priest? Why not derive that prohibition a fortiori from her being prohibited to a regular priest? [It is mentioned to teach us that] just as the prohibition of a divorced woman is distinct from that of a zonah and a challalah in respect to a regular priest [see above], so the prohibition

of a widowed woman is distinct from that of a divorced woman, a challalah, and a zonah in respect to a high-priest (*Ibid.* b). 85

and a challalah - It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Yaakov says: If a priest lives with a woman who is forbidden to him by way of a positive commandment [such as that of taking a virgin], the offspring are thereby rendered challalim..." Whence is this derived? From: "A widow, and a divorced woman, and a challalah..." followed by (15): "And he shall not profane his seed [i.e., he shall not make them challalim] among his people" — all of the above [including children from a non-virgin] being referred to (Yevamoth 60a). 86,87

and a challalah - Why mention this [if even a regular priest may not take a challalah]? To teach that a challalah is the issue of a [specifically] priestly prohibition [and not of a generic one] (Kiddushin 77b).⁸⁸

a zonah - Why mention this? [Can it not be derived a fortiori from the fact that she is forbidden to a regular priest?] But [it is mentioned for the sake of the following derivation:] It is written here: "zonah," and, in respect to a regular priest: zonah." Just as here, his issue are rendered challalim; there, too, his issue are rendered challalim (Ibid.).89

these - to exclude a niddah [whose children are not rendered challalim] (Yevamoth 59a).90

he shall not take - even by he'arah [peripheral, non-consummated intercourse], as is derived: "taking"-"taking" in respect to forbidden relationships punishable by cutting-off [see commentary (47)] (*Ibid.* 54a).91

he shall not take - A Tanna taught in the presence of R. Shesheth: All who are included in: "he shall take" [i.e., "a woman in her virginity he shall take"] are included in: "he shall not take" [i.e., "these he shall not take" — so that, for example, he receives stripes for taking a widowed virgin]; and all who are not included in: "he shall take" [such as one of the illicit relations] are not included in: "he shall not take" — to exclude a high-priest who takes his widowed sister [in which event he does not receive stripes because of her widowhood, but because of her kinship] (Kiddushin 77b). 92

he shall not take - R. Yehudah said: A high-priest who lives with a

widow receives stripes on two counts; once, for: "he shall not take," and once, for: "he shall not profane" [her, invalidating her for the priesthood]. Let him also receive stripes for: "And he shall not profane his seed"? [We are speaking of an instance in which] he did not consummate the act (*Ibid.* 78a).⁹³

he shall not take - Rava said: If he lives with her, he receives stripes; if he does not live with her [e.g., if he only betroths her], he does not receive stripes, it being written: "he shall not take...and he shall not profane" — Why shall he not take? So as not to profane (*Ibid.*).94

but only a virgin - This teaches us that it is a mitzvah for him to marry a virgin (Torath Cohanim).95

a virgin from his people - to include a virgin who issues from two peoples [one of them being the people of Israel (thus satisfying: "from his people")] (Yevamoth 77b). 96

a virgin from his people - from his people, and not from a mother who was a convert (Yerushalmi Bikkurim 1:5).97

a virgin from his people shall he take as a wife - The Rabbis taught: If: "a virgin," I might think even a minor; it is, therefore, written: "a wife" [lit., "a woman"]. If: "a wife," I might think only a bogereth [one who has matured beyond maidenhood]; it is, therefore, written: "a virgin." How is this satisfied? By one who has emerged from the state of a minor and has not yet arrived at that of a bogereth. And who is that? A na'arah [a maiden — from twelve years and one day until six months thereafter, when the period of bogereth begins] (Yevamoth 61b).98

shall he take as a wife - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if a priest betrothed a widow and then was appointed high-priest he may marry her? From: "shall he take as a wife" [and in the above instance there is no new "taking" that he is performing as a high-priest]. If so, the same should apply to a shomereth yavam [a woman betrothed to him within the context of levirate marriage while he was not yet high-priest]. This cannot be, for it is written: "a wife," and not "a yevamah" [one falling to him for levirate marriage] (Ibid. a). 99,100

21:15 And he shall not profane his seed among his people, for I am the L-rd, who makes him holy.

And he shall not profane - Rava said: If a high-priest lived with a widow, though he did not betroth her, he receives stripes. Why so? For it is written: "And he shall not profane his seed among his people"—and he did profane (Kiddushin 78a). 101

And he shall not profane - to include even forcing her as profaning her (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 6:2).¹⁰²

And he shall not profane his seed - His seed are likened to him. Just as he makes [the widow with whom he lives] unfit for eating *terumah*, so his children from her make [those that they live with] unfit for eating *terumah* (Yevamoth 69a).¹⁰³

And he shall not profane his seed - He creates "chillul" [profanation vis à vis the priesthood], but not "mamzeruth" [bastardy] (Kiddushin 68a). 104

And he shall not profane his seed - This tells me only of his seed. Whence do I derive that she herself becomes a challalah? It is derived a fortiori. If her seed, who did not transgress, are rendered challalim, she, who did transgress, how much more so! And if you object: But her children were conceived in transgression [whereas she was not], it is written: "And he shall not profane" [the implication being] — he shall not profane this woman, who before was sit, and now [through such an act] is rendered profane (Ibid. 77a). 105, 106

And he shall not profane his seed - His seed is profaned, but he himself is not profaned (Sotah 21a). 107

And he shall not profane his seed - When does he transgress: "And he shall not profane his seed"? When he consummates the act (Yerushalmi Yevamoth 6:2). 108

And he shall not profane his seed among his people - It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Yaakov says: If an Israelite wed a *challalah*, her daughter is fit vis à vis the priesthood. Whence is this derived? R. Yochanan said: It is written here: "And he shall not profane his seed among his people," and (4): "Let a husband [who is a priest] not become unclean [for his wife]

among his people" — Just as there, males [were exhorted in respect to uncleanliness] and not females; here, too, males [born of a challalah become unfit] and not females. If so, the daughter of a high-priest by a widow should also be permitted [to the priesthood]? [This is not so, for] is it written: "his son"? "His seed" is written. But then the daughter of his son should be permitted! [This is not so, for] it is written: "he shall not profane his seed" — his seed are likened to him; just as he renders his daughter unfit, so his son renders his daughter unfit (Kiddushin 77a). 109,110

- 21:16 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 21:17 Speak to Aaron, saying: A man of your seed, to their generations, who will have in him a blemish, shall not come near to offer up the bread of his G-d.

A man of your seed - From here ["a man"] R. Eliezer derived that a minor is unfit for the sacrificial service, though he be without blemish (Chullin 24b).¹¹¹

who will have - This tells me only of one who will have a blemish from this pronouncement onwards, as in the case of zav and leprous-spot uncleanliness. Whence do I derive the same halachah for one who had a blemish before the pronouncement? From: "who will have a blemish" [in the Hebrew connoting all time states] (Torath Cohanim). 112

who will have a blemish - This tells me only of one who was born whole and contracted a blemish. Whence do I derive the same for one who was born blemished in his mother's womb? From: "who will have a blemish" [in the Hebrew connoting all contingencies] (*Ibid.*).¹¹³

he shall not come near - Whence is derived the prohibition against offering up of the blood by a priest with a blemish? It is written [in regard to such a priest]: "he shall not come near," and (8:9): "And the sons of Aaron brought near the blood" (Ibid.)."

the bread of his G-d - I might think that priests with blemishes are liable [i.e., that they receive stripes] for performing any priestly

function; it is, therefore, written: "bread" — Just as bread is characterized by its being the end of preliminary functions, so all that is the end of preliminary functions [to exclude the preliminary functions themselves (i.e., though a priest with a blemish may not perform them, he does not receive stripes for doing so)] (Ibid.). 115

21:18 For every man who has in him a blemish shall not come near: a man who is blind, or lame, or flat-nosed, or asymmetrical of limb.

For every man - What is the intent of this? Because it is written: "the seed of Aaron," I might think that the halachah applied to his seed only. Whence would I derive that it also applied to him? It is, therefore, written: "For every man who has in him a blemish" (*Ibid.*). 116

who has in him a blemish - This ["who will have in him a blemish"] tells me only of a permanent blemish. Whence do I derive the same halachah for a passing blemish? From: "For every man who has in him a blemish" (Ibid.). 117

a man who is blind - The Rabbis taught: "blind" — whether he is blind in both eyes or only in one. Whence is it derived that white spots on the cornea and constant watery occlusion are also considered blemishes? From: "a man who is blind" [i.e., though the impairment in vision is due not to the eye itself, but to some mal-functioning of the man] (Bechoroth 44a).118

or lame - whether he is lame in both legs or only in one. Whence is it derived that if his foot is arched and curved in the shape of a scythe this is also considered a blemish? From: "or lame" [connoting extension of inclusion] (Torath Cohanim). 119,120

or flat-nosed - The Rabbis taught: "flat-nosed" refers to one whose nose is sunken in. Whence is it derived that noses which are fore-shortened, fused at the nostrils, or cadent [i.e., "falling" beneath the lip] are also considered blemishes? From: "or flat-nosed" (Bechoroth 43b). [21,122]

or asymmetrical of limb [sarua] - "sarua" refers to a thigh that has

come out of joint. Whence is it derived that the following are also considered blemishes: the projection of a bone from his thumb, a retroprojection of his heel, a goose-footed broadness of sole? From: "or sarua" (Torath Cohanim). 123-127

- 21:19 Or a man that has in him a brokenness of foot or a brokenness of hand.
- a brokenness of foot The Rabbis taught: "a brokenness of foot" this tells me only of "a brokenness of foot." Whence do I derive for inclusion one who is knock-kneed, one who is bandy-legged, and one who is club-footed? From: "Or...a brokenness of foot" (Bechoroth 45a). 128
- a brokenness of foot An internal defect does not disqualify one from the priestly service, for it is written: "a brokenness of foot or a a brokenness of hand." Just as these are external, so all that are external (Tosefta 4 Bechoroth).¹²⁹
- or a brokenness of hand "a brokenness of hand" this tells me only of "a brokenness of hand." Whence do I derive for inclusion one whose fingers are fused at their tips or from the base to the middle phalange without being incised? From: "or a brokenness of hand" (Bechoroth 45a). 130
- 21:20 Or one who is gibein or dak or tevalul in his eye; or one who is garav or yalefeth or meroach ashech.

Or one who is gibein - If one has no eye brow, or if he has only one eye brow, this is the "gibein" referred to in the Torah (*Ibid.* 43b).¹³¹

or dak - This is a withered spot in the eye, a disease also called "chilazon," "nachash," or "inav" (Ibid. 38a). 132

or dak - A black, sunken dak is a blemish; a "floating" one is not a blemish. A white, sunken dak is not a blemish; a "floating" one is a blemish (*Ibid.* b).¹³³

or dak, etc. - Rava said: Why does the Torah write: "or dak ... or tevalul

in his eye" [i.e., Why is it not sufficient to mention one]? It is necessary. For if "dak" alone were mentioned, I would think [that it is considered a blemish] because it involves a loss of sight, but that a blurring of sight ["tevalul"] is not considered a blemish; it is, therefore, written: "tevalul." And if "tevalul" alone were mentioned, I would think [that it is considered a blemish] because it involves a blurring of vision, but that a disorientation of vision is not considered a blemish; it is, therefore, written: "in his eye" (Ibid. 44a). 134-137

tevalul in his eye - What is "tevalul"? If the white breaks through the ring and enters the black [this is "tevalul"]. If the black enters the white, this is not a blemish (*Ibid.* 38a). 138

tevalul in his eye - If the lid of the eye were pierced, injured, or split, this is considered a blemish of the eye (*Ibid.*).¹³⁹

tevalul in his eye - Any defect of the eye is implied. From here it is derived that if both his eyes were oriented upwards or downwards, if one were oriented upwards and the other downwards, if he saw the room and the attic as one, if he spoke with one and gave another the impression that he was looking at him [— all of these are considered blemishes of the eye] (*Ibid.* 44a). 140-142

or one who is garav - "garav" refers to a scabby condition (Ibid. 41a). 143

or one who is garav - "Yabeleth" is not stated in respect to [the blemishes of a] man, and "dak" and "tevalul" are not stated in respect to a beast [see 22:22]. Whence do we derive that what is stated to be a blemish in the one is also considered a blemish in the other. From: "garav": "yalefeth"-"yalefeth" [stated in respect to both man and beast] to serve as a paradigm for mutual inclusion (Ibid. 43a). 144

or yalefeth - This is the Egyptian lichen. Why is it called "yalefeth"? Because it clings tenaciously ["melafefeth"] until the day of death (Ibid. 41a). 145,146

or meroach ashech - If one has no testicles, or if he has only one testicle, this is the "meroach ashech" referred to in the Torah. R. Yishmael says: [It refers to] one whose testicles were crushed. R. Akiva says: One with

distended testicles. R. Chanina b. Antignos says: [It refers to] one whose skin has taken on a swarthy coloration (*Ibid.* 44b). 147-150

21:21 Every man in whom there is a blemish, of the seed of Aaron the priest, shall not come near to offer up the fire-offerings of the L-rd. There is a blemish in him; the bread of his G-d he shall not come near to offer up.

Every man - to include one with the skin-coloring of a Cushite, one who is red-spotted, one who is white-spotted, one who is pole-like in appearance [i.e., unusually long and thin], one who is dwarf-like, a deaf-mute, an imbecile, a drunkard, and those with [halachically] clean plague-spots (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁵¹

in whom there is a blemish - to exclude [from disqualification] a treifah [i.e., one with an internal defect] and one delivered by Caesarian section (*Ibid.*).¹⁵²

of the seed of Aaron - One whose head is wedge-shaped, or turnip-shaped, or mallet-shaped; one whose head is sunken or unarched [in the back]; one who is hump-backed — all of these are unfit, it being written: "Every man in whom there is a blemish, of the seed of Aaron the priest" — a man who bears a semblance to "the seed of Aaron the priest" [(i.e., one with a normal human semblance) shall serve] (Bechoroth 43a). 153, 154

shall not come near to offer up-to include [as prohibited to a priest with a blemish] presentation of the devoted portions, the fistful, the frankincense, the incense, the meal-offerings of the priests and of the anointed priest, the libations, the pouring-out, the mixing, and the lifting, the servings, the fistfuls, the crumblings, the saltings, the pinchings, and the receivings [That is, not only are the ultimate services forbidden, but also all of the acts ancillary and preparatory to them] (Torath Cohanim). 155

There is a blemish in him - to exclude [from disqualification] one whose blemish has left him (*Ibid.*). 156

21:22 The bread of his G-d, of the holy of holy, and of the holy he may eat.

and of the holy he may eat - "of the holy of holy" — these are higher-order sanctities; "and of the holy" — these are lower-order sanctities (Zevachim 101b).¹⁵⁷

21:23 But to the veil he shall not come, and to the altar he shall not come near, a blemish is in him; and he shall not profane My holy places, for I am the L-rd who sanctifies them.

But to the veil - R. Cahana taught: Because it is written: "But to the veil," I might think that priests with blemishes were not permitted to enter between the hall and the altar to do repair work; it is, therefore, written: "But" [implying limitation of exclusion] (Eruvin 105a). 158

and he shall not profane - From here it is derived that the service of a priest with a blemish is rendered profane (*Bechoroth* 43b).¹⁵⁹

21:24 And Moses spoke to Aaron and to his sons and to all the children of Israel.

and to all the children of Israel - He exhorted the priests by way of the Israelites [i.e., they (the *beth-din*) were exhorted to watch over the priests to assure the observance of these laws] (*Torath Cohanim*). 160

- 22:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 22:2 Speak to Aaron and to his children that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they not profane My holy name, which they make holy to Me; I am the L-rd.

that they separate themselves ["veyinazru"] - "nezirah" connotes separation, as it is written (Ezekiel 14:7); "who separates himself

["veyinazer"] from Me," and (Isaiah 1:4): "They have separated ["nazoru"] and turned back" (Ibid.).1

that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel - This teaches us that if a non-priest performed the service, his service is profane (Zevachim 16b).²

from the holy things of the children of Israel - There is no liability for uncleanliness in respect to the offerings of gentiles, it being written: "that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel" (Ibid. 45a).³

from the holy things of the children of Israel - This tells me only of the holy things of the children of Israel. Whence do we derive [that the same halachah applies to] their own holy things? From: "which they make holy to Me; I am the L-rd" — to include all [holy things] (Torath Cohanim).4

and that they not profane - It was taught: Whence is it derived that a priest who served in a state of uncleanliness incurs the death penalty? From: "that they not profane My Holy name" [the halachah being derived] "profanation" - "profanation" from what is stated in respect to [the eating of] terumah [in a state of uncleanliness]. Just as the "profanation" of terumah is punishable by death, so the "profanation" here is punishable by death (Sanhedrin 83b).

and that they not profane - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the defect of nothar [see 19:6] is also being referred to here [as well as the defect of uncleanliness]? From: "and that they not profane" ["velo yechallelu" (intimating two profanations in the Hebrew)]. Scripture speaks of two profanations: one, that of nothar; the other, that of uncleanliness (Zevachim 45b).6

which they make holy - The Rabbis taught: I might think that uncleanliness liability would be incurred only for those offerings which had "permitters" [(i.e., preceding operations (such as the sprinkling of the blood) which "permitted" the devoted portions to the altar and the flesh to the priests)] for man and for the altar; it is, therefore, written: "which they make holy to Me" [intimating offerings for which there are no "permitters."] I might think immediately [i.e., that with those

offerings for which there are "permitters" uncleanliness liability is incurred immeditely, even before the "permitting" operations]; it is, therefore, written (3): "who will draw near, etc." [the connotation in the Hebrew being: "who will make unclean that which has been readied for sacrifice (by means of the "permitters")] (*Ibid.*).^{7,8}

22:3 Say to them: Throughout your generations, every man who will draw near, of all of your seed, to the holy things that the children of Israel make holy to the L-rd, and his uncleanliness be upon him, then that soul will be cut off from before Me; I am the L-rd.

Say to them: Throughout your generations - "Say to them" — to those standing at Mount Sinai: "Throughout your generations" — the generations to come (Bava Bathra 120a).

every man - "every man" — to include all Israelites [in the prohibition — even non-priests]; "of all your seed" — to include women (*Torath Cohanim*). 10

who will draw near - R. Elazar said: Now is he who touches liable? [Is not liability incurred only for eating?] Why, then, is it written: "Who shall draw near"? Until it has been readied for sacrifice [see commentary (7,8)] (Zevachim 45b).¹¹

from before Me; I am the L-rd - I might think [that he will be "cut off"] from one place to a different place [i.e., that he will not die, but only be exiled]; it is, therefore, written: "I am the L-rd" — in every place I am the L-rd [so that change of place will not save him from death] (Torath Cohanim). 12

22:4 A man, a man, of the seed of Aaron the priest, if he is a leper or a zav [see section 15], of the holy things he shall not eat until he is clean. And one who touches anyone who is unclean through the dead; or a man from whom semen issues.

A man, a man - to include an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition against eating terumah (Yevamoth 70a).¹³

A man, a man - This tells me only of a man. Whence do I derive a woman [for inclusion in the prohibition]? From (3): "of all your seed" (Torath Cohanim).14

A man, a man - see commentary (154) on 21:21

of the seed of Aaron - This tells me only of the seed of Aaron. Whence is Aaron himself derived [as subsumed in the prohibition]? From: "if he is a leper or a zav" (Torath Cohanim).¹⁵

of the holy things he shall not eat - Which "holy things" is Scripture referring to? *Terumah*. Whence is this derived? R. Yochanan said: [It is derived from:] "A man, a man, of the seed of Aaron the priest, if he is a leper or a zav, of the holy things he shall not eat until he is clean." What is it that is common [in respect to permissibility of eating] to the seed of Aaron [i.e., to both men and women]? *Terumah*. (Yevamoth 74a). 16

And one who touches anyone who is unclean - This teaches us that this type of uncleanliness is contracted only by touching [and not by lifting, etc.] (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁷

22:5 Or a man who touches any creeping thing by which he becomes unclean, or a [dead] man by which he becomes unclean, to all of his uncleanliness,

Or a man - Whence is [inclusion in the prohibition] derived for one who touches semen? From: "Or a man" [reverting to the end of the preceding verse: "or a man from whom semen issues"] (Niddah 43b).¹⁸

any creeping thing - "any creeping thing" — to include an animal carcass; "by which he becomes unclean" — to include [becoming unclean not only by touching the whole object, but even particles of] the size required for uncleanliness (Torath Cohanim).¹⁹

22:6 The soul that touches it shall be unclean until the evening;

and he shall not eat of the holy things until he bathes his flesh in water.

The soul that touches it - "that touches" — to exclude [becoming unclean by] causing it to move (Ibid.). 20

until he bathes his flesh - It was taught: It is written here: "until he bathes his flesh in water," and, elsewhere (7): "And when the sun sets he shall be clean" [incidating that bathing of the flesh is not sufficient]! How is this to be resolved? This [i.e., our verse] refers to [permissibility for eating] ma'aser, [bathing, without waiting for the sun to set, being sufficient for this]; the other verse refers to terumah [which may not be eaten until the sun has set on the day of his bathing] (Yevamoth 74b).²¹

bathes his flesh in water - I might think that he could bathe each limb individually; it is, therefore, written: "And when the sun sets he shall be clean" — just as the sun sets as a whole, so the bathing in water must be as a whole [and not limb by limb] (Torath Cohanim).²²

And when the sun sets he shall be clean, and then he may eat of the holy things, for it is his bread.

And when the sun sets he shall be clean - It was taught: "And when the sun sets he shall be clean" — the setting of the sun is a prerequisite for his eating terumah, but his atonement [i.e., the bringing of his offering] is not a prerequisite for his eating terumah (Berachoth 2a).²³

And when the sun sets he shall be clean - What is the intent of: [lit.,]: "And when the sun comes and clean"? "And when the sun comes" — when the sun comes down [i.e., when it sets]; "and clean" — and the day is clean [i.e., when the sun has "cleansed itself" (that is, when it has disappeared) then he may eat terumah (without waiting for the offering of his sacrifice on the next day)]. But perhaps it is to be understood as: "And when the sun comes" — the coming of its light [i.e., its rising on the day after his immersion]; "and clean" — the cleaning of the man [i.e., "he shall clean himself" (by bringing his offering)]! Rabbah b. R. Shila answered: If so, it should have been written: "and he shall be clean" (Ibid. b).24

And when the sun sets he shall be clean - And above (6) it is written:

"until he bathes his flesh in water"! There is no contradiction: this refers to *terumah*; the other refers to *ma'aser* [see commentary (21)] (Yevamoth 74b).²⁵

of the holy things - ["of the holy things," and not all of the holy things] to exclude [from permission to eat, sanctified food that became] intermixed with less than one hundred sa'ah of terumah [in which case he must wait until he brings his offering until he may eat of it] (Yerushalmi Arlah 2:1).26

of the holy things -This [phrase] subsumes [for inclusion in the prohibition] terumah food [which became intermixed] with [less than one hundred sa'ah of non-terumah food; non-terumah food [which became intermixed with] terumah food; terumah drink with non-terumah drink; non-terumah drink with terumah drink (Ibid.).²⁷

of the holy things - A clean priest who ate unclean *terumah* is in violation of a positive commandment, it being written: "and then he may eat of the holy things" — of the clean ones, and not of the unclean ones. And every negative commandment derived by way of a positive commandment is considered a positive commandment (*Yerushalmi Bikkurim* 2:1).²⁸

for it is his bread - This teaches us that he takes up the wheat as he wishes and perforates the greens as much as he wishes [i.e., he need not be especially circumspect with his food] (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁹

for it is his bread - It was taught: I might think that vegetable trimmings [of terumah] were regarded as profane [i.e., non-terumah]; it is, therefore, written: "for it is his bread" — it retains its sanctity (*Ibid.*).³⁰

22:8 A neveilah [the carcass of an animal that died by itself] and a treifah [a torn animal] he shall not eat to become unclean thereby; I am the L-rd.

A neveilah and a treifah - It was taught: I might think that the neveilah of an unclean bird made one's clothing unclean upon entering the esophagus; it is, therefore, written: "A neveilah and a treifah he shall

not eat to become unclean thereby" — [the allusion is to] that which comes under the prohibition against eating *neveilah*, and not that which comes under the prohibition against eating an unclean animal (*Chullin* 100b).³¹

22:9 And they shall keep My charge, that they not bear sin because of it. And they will die for it if they profane it; I am the L-rd who makes them holy.

And they shall keep My charge - They shall create a "keeping" for it and exhort beth-din thereto (Torath Cohanim).³²

that they not bear sin because of it - Shmuel said: Whence is it derived that an unclean priest who eats clean *terumah* incurs the death penalty? From: "And they shall keep My charge, that they not bear sin because of it" [followed by: "And they will die for it, etc." (Sanhedrin 83a).³³

And they will die for it - "for it" — and not for [eating] ma'aser [in a state of uncleanliness]; "for it" — and not for [defiling] the first shearings (Yevamoth 86b, Chullin 136a).³⁴

And they will die for it - R. Yochanan said: All who give terumah to a priest who is an ignoramus hasten his death, as it is written: "And they will die for it if they profane it" [and an ignoramus is likely to profane it] (Sanhedrin 90b).³⁵

if they profane it - Shmuel said in the name of R. Elazar: Whence is it derived that an unclean priest who eats unclean terumah does not incur the death penalty? From: "And they will die for it if they profane it"—to exclude that which is already profaned (*Ibid.* 83a).³⁶

if they profane it - It was taught: If a priest smears himself with oil of terumah, his daughter's son, [if he is] an Israelite, may rub it on himself without apprehension, it being written: "And they will die for it if they profane it" — but once it has already been profaned [i.e., used for a mundane purpose], it is profane (Krituth 7a).^{37,38}

if they profane it - to exclude [from death or stripes] a clean priest who ate of that which was unclean [and, thus, already profaned] (*Torath Cohanim*).³⁹

I am the L-rd - In the ways of the world, if a king issues a decree, if he so desires, he fulfills it; and if he wishes, others fulfill it. But the Holy One Blessed be He issues a decree and is the first to fulfill it. Whence is this derived? From: "And they shall keep My charge [lit., "My keeping"]...I am the L-rd." I am He who was the first to keep the mitzvoth of the Torah (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:3).40

22:10 And every non-priest shall not eat the holy thing; the tenant of a priest or his hired man shall not eat the holy thing.

And every non-priest - Terumah is permitted to a mourner, it being written: "And every non-priest shall not eat the holy thing"—it is non-priesthood which disqualifies one from terumah and not the state of mourning (Yevamoth 70b).41

And every non-priest - A non-priest who ate *terumah* incurs the death penalty, it being written: "And they will die for it if they profane it... and every non-priest shall not eat the holy thing" (*Sanhedrin* 83b).⁴²

And every non-priest ["zar"] - I might think "zar" refers to a mamzer [a bastard]; it is, therefore, written: "And every zar" — even a Levite, even an Israelite (Torath Cohanim).⁴³

shall not eat - "eating" is not less than the size of an olive (Ibid.).44

shall not eat the holy thing - It is written here: "the holy thing," and, elsewhere (*Deuteronomy* 26:13): "I have removed the holy thing." Just as "the holy thing" stated there refers to "the holy things of the boundary" [i.e., terumah and ma'aser, which may be eaten within the entire boundary of Eretz Yisrael, as opposed to "the holy things of the altar," which may be eaten only in Jerusalem], so "the holy thing" stated here refers to "the holy things of the boundary" (*Ibid.*).45

the tenant of a priest or his hired man ["toshav cohain vesachir"] - Which is "toshav" and which is "sachir"? "Toshav" is one that is acquired forever [i.e., a servant whose ear is bored and who serves until the Jubilee year]; "sachir" is one that is acquired for years [i.e., a servant who leaves after six years] (Yevamoth 70a).46

the tenant of a priest or his hired man - It was taught: R. Elazar said: Whence is it derived that an aral [one that is uncircumcised] may not eat terumah? It is written here: "Toshav vesachir," and, in respect to the Paschal lamb: "Toshav vesachir." Just as with the "toshav vesachir" stated in respect to the Paschal lamb, an aral may not eat of it, so, with the "toshav vesachir" stated in respect to terumah, an aral may not eat of it (Ibid.).⁴⁷

22:11 And a priest, if he acquire a soul, the acquisition of his money, he may eat of it, and one that is born in his house — they may eat of his bread.

And a priest, if he acquire - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if a priest bought a [gentile] servant in which an Israelite possessed partownership — even one-hundredth — that he does not cause him to eat terumah? From: "And a priest, if he acquire" [connoting total acquisition] (Yerushalmi Terumoth 11:5).48

if he acquire a soul - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if a priest whose testicles are crushed [and who is, therefore, forbidden to marry into the congregation of Israel] — whence is it derived that if he married the daughter of converts, he causes her to eat *terumah* [as an "acquisition" of his]? From: "And a priest, if he acquire a soul, the acquisition of his money, he may eat of it" (Yevamoth 57b).⁴⁹

the acquisition of his money - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if a priest marries a woman and acquires [gentile] servants [as opposed to Hebrew servants, whose body he does not acquire] — whence is it derived that he causes them to eat *terumah*? From: "And a priest, if he acquire a soul, the acquisition of his money, he may eat of it" (*Ibid*. 66b). 50

the acquisition of his money - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if the wife of a priest acquired servants, or if his servants acquired servants — whence is it derived that they [the acquired servants] may eat terumah? From: "And a priest, if he acquire a soul, the acquisition of his money, he may eat of it" — his acquisition that, in turn, acquired, causes the latter to eat [So, the structural intimation of the verse] (Ibid.).⁵¹

the acquisition of his money - The daughter of an Israelite who married a priest who was a deaf-mute may not eat terumah. Why so? For Scripture states: "the acquisition of his money," and a deaf-mute cannot effect acquisition (*Ibid.* 68a).⁵²

the acquisition of his money - Ulla said: According to the Torah, [(though it was forbidden by the Rabbis)] the daughter of an Israelite who was betrothed to a priest may eat *terumah*; for it is written: "And a priest, if he acquire a soul, the acquisition of his money" — and this one [the betrothed], too, is "the acquisition of his money" (*Kethuvoth* 57b).⁵³

the acquisition of his money - An [Israelite] woman awaiting levirate marriage [to a priest] does not eat terumah. Why so? For Scripture states: "the acquisition of his money," and this one [i.e., the woman awaiting levirate marriage] is the acquisition of his money" (Kethuvoth 57b).⁵⁴

the acquisition of his money - A servant who is lacking [only] a writ of manumission [to set him free] may not eat *terumah*. Why so? For Scripture states: "the acquisition of his money," and this one [i.e., a servant in this state] is not "the acquisition of his money" (Gittin 42b).⁵⁵

the acquisition of his money - followed by: "and one that is born in his house." The "acquisition of his money" is being likened to "one that is born in his house." Just as the latter [may eat terumah] though he be worth nothing [in economic terms], so the former [may eat terumah] though he be worth nothing (Ibid. 43a).⁵⁶

the acquisition of his money - It was taught: If one [i.e., a priest] says to his wife: "This is your divorce — except for your terumah" [i.e., You are free to marry another, but you are still mine in that you may eat terumah], do we say [that it is a valid divorce since] in respect to marriage he left nothing [of her to himself]; or do we say [that since he calls her his in respect to eating terumah] she is regarded as "the acquisition of his money" [and, retaining "acquisition" in her, the divorce is not valid]? This question remained unresolved [and he would need to write a new bill of divorce without the above reservation clause] (Ibid. 85a).⁵⁷

and one that is born in his house - A fetus [of a woman who conceived by a priest, who died] does not cause the woman to eat *terumah*, for it is written: "and one that is born in his house" — one that is *born* causes [his mother] to eat; one that is not yet born does not cause [his mother] to eat (Yevamoth 67a). 58

and one that is born in his house - What is the intent of this [i.e., Is it not obvious that he (being the son of his maid-servant, who is his "acquisition,") eats terumah]? Because it is written: "the acquisition of his money," I would say: Just as "the acquisition of his money" has monetary value, so, "one that is born in his house," if he has monetary value, eats terumah, and if he does not have monetary value, does not eat terumah; it is, therefore, written: "and one that is born in his house" — in any event [i.e., irrespective of his possessing or not possessing monetary value] (Gittin 43a). ^{59,60}

they may eat - "They may eat" [terumah], but animals may not eat it. I might think that they are not even permitted to eat carshinah [horsebean, rarely used as human food]; it is, therefore, written: "soul" [i.e., "And a priest, if he acquire a soul" — and animals are also subsumed under that term] (Torath Cohanim).61

they may eat of his bread - A one-day old infant, [the offspring of a priest who died,] causes [his mother] to eat *terumah*, as it is written: "and one that is born in his house — they may eat of his bread," which can be read as: "they *cause* to eat" (Niddah 44a).⁶²

of his bread - to exclude [authorization to eat the *terumah* of] the dead, who do not have bread [i.e., who are not considered to possess it] (*Torath Cohanim*).⁶³

22:12 And the daughter of a priest, if she will be [wed] to a man who is a non-priest, she, of the *terumah* of the holy things shall not eat.

And the daughter of a priest - This tells us of the daughter of a priest. Whence do we derive the same for the daughter of a Levite or of an Israelite [i.e., that if they live with those who are forbidden to them and subsequently marry a priest, they may not eat terumah]? From: "And

the daughter," the superfluity connoting extension of inclusion (Yevamoth 68b).64

if she will be - All who live with those who are forbidden to them are disqualified from eating *terumah*. [But] let us say [that only such are disqualified] who live with those, a relationship with whom is punishable by cutting-off [and not such as are forbidden by negative commandment alone]! [This is not so, for] Scripture writes: "if she will be" — [the reference is to] those to whom "being" [i.e., being wed] applies, and those, a relationship with whom is punishable by cutting-off, are not subsumed in such "being" (*Ibid.* a and b). 65,66

if she will be - A widow who was betrothed to a high-priest or a woman who had been divorced or had performed *chalitzah*, who was betrothed to a regular priest, may not eat *terumah* [i.e., the *terumah* of their father, if he is a priest]. Why so? It is written here: "being" [i.e., "if she will be"], and elsewhere, "being," viz. (*Deuteronomy* 22:23): "If there be, a maiden, a virgin, betrothed to a man" — Just as the "being" mentioned there applies to betrothal, so the "being" mentioned here applies to betrothal [and this type of "being" disqualifies her from *terumah*] (*Yerushalmi Yevamoth* 6:3). 67,68

to a man who is a non-priest - even if he is a Levite or an Israelite [and not only if he is a nathin or a mamzer (see commentary [43])]; for it is written (13): "then she shall return to the house of her father as in her maidenhood" — the implication being that as long as she is with him [her husband who is a non-priest, though he be a Levite or an Israelite], she may not eat terumah (Sanhedrin 51a).⁶⁹

to a man who is a non-priest - Whence is it derived [that the halachah applies] even if it were a widow who wed a high-priest or one who had been divorced or had performed chalitzah who wed a regular priest? From: "to a man" — to a man that causes one to eat terumah [i.e., a priest in a permitted relationship (as opposed to the above)] (Torath Cohanim). 70

she, etc. - She does not eat terumah [because of her marriage to a non-priest], but her mother [if her husband, the priest, died] does eat, [for though her daughter may not eat, she still remains her "seed" by a

priest, on the strength of which the mother may continue to eat terumah] (Ibid.).⁷¹

of the terumah of the holy things - Of that which is "lifted" [muram] of the holy things, she [i.e., the widowed daughter of a priest referred to in the next verse,] may not eat [when she returns to her father's house, though she may eat terumah itself]. And what are they [i.e., those things which are "lifted" in the sacrificial ceremony]? The breast and the thigh (Yevamoth 68b).⁷²

22:13 And the daughter of a priest, if she be widowed or divorced, and she have no seed, then she shall return to the house of her father as in her maidenhood. From the bread of her father she may eat, but no non-priest may eat of it.

widowed or divorced - It was taught: Whence is it derived that an idolator or a servant who lives with the daughter of a priest, a Levite, or an Israelite disqualifies her from eating terumah? From: "And the daughter of a priest, if she be widowed or divorced, etc." — one who can render her [halachically] widowed or divorced [makes it possible for her to eat terumah upon her return to her father's house], but not an idolator or a servant, who can not render her widowed or divorced (Ibid.)."

and she have no seed - The Rabbis taught: "and she have no seed"—this tells me only of her own children [as disqualifying her from eating terumah]. Whence do I derive the same halachah for her children's children? From: "and she have no seed" — in any event [i.e., immediate or distant] (Ibid. 70a).⁷⁴

and she have no seed - This tells me only of legitimate children [as disqualifying her from eating terumah]. Whence do I derive the same halachah for illegitimate children? From: "and she have no seed" [Heb., "vezera ein lah"] — "ayin alehah" [i.e., "look into it" (and you might find other [i.e., illegitimate] seed which disqualifies her)] (Ibid.).75

and she have no seed - R. Yehudah of Deskarta said to Rava: Let us

make dead children as live ones in respect to terumah a fortiori [i.e., let her dead children disqualify her from eating terumah just as her live ones do], viz.: Now if in the case of levirate marriage, where a child from her first husband is not made equivalent to a child from her second husband to exempt her from levirate marriage, still, dead children [from the second husband (i.e., children of the second husband who died after their father had died)] are made equivalent to living children [to exempt her from levirate marriage], should it not follow a fortiori that where a child from the first husband is made equivalent to a child from the second husband to disqualify her from terumah, that dead children should be made equivalent to live ones [to disqualify her from terumah]! [This a fortiori argument is not entertained, for] it is written: "and she have no seed"—and, in effect, [if her children have died], she has no seed (Ibid. 87b). 76

and she have no seed - A one-day-old infant disqualifies his mother from eating terumah. Why so? For it is written: "and she have no seed," but [in the above instance] she does have seed! (Niddah 44a).⁷⁷

then she shall return to the house of her father - The daughter of a priest that was married to an Israelite, who died, and who had a son by him, who also died, returns to her father's house [for the eating of *terumah*]. In this connection it is written: "then she shall return to the house of her father as in her maidenhood" (Yevamoth 87a).⁷⁸

to the house of her father as in her maidenhood - The Rabbis taught: "then she shall return to the house of her father" — to exclude a woman awaiting levirate marriage; "as in her maidenhood" — to exclude one who is pregnant (*Ibid.*). ^{79,80}

From the bread of her father she may eat - The Rabbis taught: When she returns, she returns to *terumah*, but she does not return to the breast and the thigh. Why so? "From the bread," and not all the bread — to exclude the breast and the thigh (*Ibid.*).81

but no non-priest - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the daughter of a priest who married an Israelite and then ate *terumah*, and, similarly, a priest who ate the *terumah* of his neighbor are not liable for the fifth? From: "but no non-priest may eat of it. And a man if he eat the holy

thing unwittingly, then he shall add its fifth upon it "— to exclude those who are not non-priests (*Torath Cohanim*).82

22:14 And a man, if he eat the holy thing unwittingly, then he shall add its fifth upon it, and he shall give to the priest the holy thing.

And a man - to exclude a minor (Ibid.).83

if he eat - "eating," in general, is the size of an olive (Pesachim 32b).84

if he eat - to exclude such eating as is injurious to him [in which instance he does not pay the fifth] (Yoma 80b).85

if he eat - whether he eat, drink, or anoint himself (Bava Metzia 54b).86

if he eat the holy thing - [any holy thing] whether clean or unclean terumah (Ibid.).87

unwittingly - It was taught: All [i.e., both knowing and unwitting violators] were included in the interdiction against a non-priest's eating terumah [and, according to the rule that those who come under an interdiction of stripes do not incur monetary liability, there should be no payment in a case of unwitting violation; however,] an exception is created by: "And a man, if he eat the holy thing unwittingly," explicitly stipulating monetary liability (Yerushalmi Terumoth 7:1).88

unwittingly - to exclude [one-fifth liability] in an instance of knowing violation (*Torath Cohanim*).89

then he shall add its fifth - so that it and its fifth are five [e.g., if the value were four, he does not pay one-fifth of the four, but adds, as it were, an equal fifth part to the four parts] (Bava Metzia 54a).90

then he shall add its fifth - This teaches us that he pays many fifths [i.e., if he paid the fifth for having eaten *terumah* and then ate that fifth, he pays a fifth on that] (*Ibid.* b).⁹¹

then he shall add its fifth upon it - "upon it" — to include its fifth as similar to it. That is, just as the base payment is made with non-terumah, so the fifth is paid with non-terumah (Ibid. a). 92

then he shall add its fifth upon it - "upon it," and not upon ma'aser [so eaten]; "upon it," and not upon the first of the shearings [if he wore them] (Yevamoth 6a; Chullin 136a).⁹³

and he shall give to the priest - This teaches us that it is the giving which renders it holy vis à vis liability for an offering and a fifth, and it is not its separation [for giving] which renders it thus holy (Yerushalmi Terumoth 6a).⁹⁴

and he shall give to the priest the holy thing - From here R. Akiva derived: Payment is made only with the same kind of food that he ate, as it is written: "and he shall give to the priest the holy thing" — the [same] holy thing that he ate (Terumoth 6:6).95

and he shall give to the priest the holy thing - That which lends itself to becoming a holy thing — to exclude [from liability] one who ate terumah and chametz on Pesach, [the fact that such food has no value whatsoever] exempting him from payment [for the food itself] and [even for] its fuel value (Pesachim 32a).⁹⁶

and he shall give to the priest the holy thing - that which can become holy [so, the signification in the Hebrew]. This teaches us that terumah is paid for only by non-terumah (Bava Metzia 54a).⁹⁷

22:15 And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel which they will lift to the L-rd.

And they shall not profane - to include [in the prohibition] one who anoints [himself with terumah] as well as one who drinks it (Niddah 32a). 98

And they shall not profane, etc. - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: A sin-offering which was slaughtered as a burnt-offering is rendered unfit; if it was slaughtered as non-sacred, it remains fit. What is Rav's source? It is written: "And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel" — Holy ones [(in the case of the verse, the priests, who are holy,)] profane holy things; profane ones [with reference to the verse, non-priests,] do not profane holy things (Zevachim 46b).99

And they shall not profane, etc. - Priests and Levites who help out in

the granaries [in order to receive tithes] are not given *terumah* or *ma'aser*, and one who gives it is guilty of profanation; for it is written: "And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel"—and they *do* profane them [thereby] (*Yerushalmi Demai* 6:2).¹⁰⁰

which they will lift - Whence is it derived that one who eats tevel [food from which terumah has not been taken] incurs the penalty of death? From: "And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel which they will lift to the L-rd." The verse is speaking of what will be lifted [i.e., "tevel," from which terumah will be lifted], and the penalty is derived: "profanation" [i.e., "they shall not profane"] - "profanation," from what is stated in respect to terumah. Just as there, the penalty [for eating terumah] is death; so, here, the penalty [for eating tevel] is death (Sanhedrin 83a). 101

which they will lift - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one who eats his fruits in a state of *tevel* or a Levite who eats his tithes in a state of *tevel* is exempt from payment? From: "And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel which they will lift to the L-rd" — there is no liability until they have been lifted (*Chullin* 130b). 102

22:16 And they will cause them to bear the sin of guilt when they eat their holy things; for I am the L-rd who makes them holy.

And they will cause them to bear the sin of guilt - It was taught in the school of R. Elazar b. Yaakov: All who give *terumah* to a priest who is an ignoramus [and, thus, likely to make the *terumah* unclean] cause him to bear the sin of guilt, as it is written: "And they will cause them to bear the sin of guilt when they eat their holy things" (Sanhedrin 90b).¹⁰³

when they eat their holy things - ["eat"] — to exclude [from liability] a non-priest who scatters *terumah* or makes it unclean [in which case he derives no benefit from it] (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁰⁴

22:17 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:

22:18 Speak to Aaron and to his sons and to the children of Israel, and say to them: A man, a man, of the house of Israel, and of the proselyte in Israel, who will present his offering, of all of their vows and all of their free-will offerings, which they will present to the L-rd as a burnt-offering,

A man, a man, etc. - "A man, a man" — to include gentiles along with Jews, as donors of vow-offerings and free-will offerings; "which they will present to the L-rd as a burnt-offering" — whatever they bring is offered as a burnt-offering (*Menachoth* 73b).¹⁰⁵

and of the proselyte in Israel - "the proselyte" — to include the wives of proselytes; "in Israel" — to include women and servants (*Torath Cohanim*). 106

of all of their vows, etc. - "of all of their vows and of all of their freewill offerings" — From here it was derived that what is left over from vows is used for free-will offerings (Nazir 25a).¹⁰⁷

of all of their vows, etc. - What is a vow? "I take it upon myself to bring a burnt-offering." What is a free-will offering? "I designate this animal as a burnt-offering." What is the difference between them? With vows, if the animals die or are stolen, others must be substituted; with free-will offerings, others need not be substituted (Kinnim 1:1).¹⁰⁸

which they will present - This tells us that all of them [i.e., free-will offerings] may be presented in partnership (Menachoth 104b).¹⁰⁹

to the L-rd as a burnt-offering - This teaches us that all vows and freewill offerings that are to be offered up are offered up as burnt-offerings. I might think that even a bird is thus offered up; it is, therefore, written (19): "of the cattle, of the sheep, and of the goats" — only a beast is offered up as a burnt-offering (Yerushalmi Shekalim 4:8).¹¹⁰

22:19 According to your wills, a male without blemish, of the cattle, of the sheep, and of the goats.

According to your wills - This teaches us that no coercion is exercised

for the presentation of communal offerings (Torath Cohanim). 111

a male without blemish, of the cattle, etc. - From here it is derived that the absence of blemishes and maleness are qualifications for beasts, but not for birds (*Kiddushin* 24b).¹¹²

22:20 Whatever has a blemish in it you shall not present, for it will not be acceptable for you.

Whatever has a blemish - to include a passing blemish (Torath Cohanim). 113

you shall not present - The Rabbis taught: What is the intent of this? If to prohibit the slaughtering [of animals with blemishes], this is already stated below (22)! How, then, are we to understand: "you shall not present"? You shall not designate as sacred. From here it was derived: One who dedicates animals with blemishes to the altar transgresses five injunctions: "You shall not make sacred"; "You shall not slaughter"; "You shall not sprinkle the blood"; "You shall not cause [the fats] to smoke"; "You shall not cause part [of the fats] to smoke" (Temurah 6b). 114-116

for it will not be acceptable - It is written: "for it will not be acceptable," and (23): "it shall not be accepted" [to teach that even the tzitz (the high-priest's front plate) will not cause it to be accepted] (Menachoth 25a). 117

22:21 And if a man present a sacrifice of peace-offerings to the L-rd for an explicit vow or as a free-will offering, of the cattle or of the sheep, perfect shall it be for acceptance; no blemish shall be in it.

a sacrifice of peace-offerings - This tells me only of peace-offerings. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the rule] burnt-offerings? From: "vow" [a burnt-offering being mandatory, and, in that sense, a vow]. Thank-offerings? From: "free-will offering." The offering of a woman who has given birth and of a Nazirite? From: "explicit" [a similar term being stated in respect to a Nazirite, and the offering of a woman who

has given birth being likened to that of a Nazirite]. Sin-offerings and guilt-offerings? From: "a sacrifice" [the term being superfluous]. Tithes? From: "of the cattle" [this, too, being superfluous, having already been mentioned (19)]. Offspring and substitutes? From: "of the sheep" (Torath Cohanim). 118-123

perfect shall it be - "perfect" — yes; lacking — no [i.e., even an internal imperfection disqualifies it] (Bechoroth 39a).¹²⁴

perfect shall it be for acceptance - It was taught: One who blemishes a beast that is already blemished is not liable, it being written: "perfect shall it be for acceptance" [i.e., perfection is required only if it is acceptable and not if it is already blemished] (Menachoth 56b). 125

no blemish shall be in it - It was taught: "no blemish shall be in it"—
this tells me only that he is forbidden to cause the blemish himself.
Whence is it derived that he is forbidden to produce it even indirectly,
e.g., by placing figs or dough on a beast's ear so that the dog will come
and bite it off? From: "no blemish"— direct or indirect (Bechoroth
33b). 126-128

no blemish shall be in it - It was taught: "And no blemish shall be in it." What is the intent of this? Do not deliberately cause a blemish in it (Torath Cohanim).¹²⁹

22:22 Blind or broken or charutz or yabeleth or garav or yalefeth [see commentary on 21:20] — you shall not present these to the L-rd; and a fire-offering you shall not make of them on the altar to the L-rd.

Blind - whether blind in both eyes or in one (Ibid.). 130

or broken - Because it is written (21:19): "a brokenness of foot or a brokenness of hand," I might think [that the rule applies] only if its foreleg or hind leg were broken. Whence do I derive [the same rule for] a broken tail? From: "or broken" (Ibid.).¹³¹

or charutz - [What is "charutz"?] If the lid of the eye were pierced, injured, or split and so the nose; and so the lip (Bechoroth 38a, 39a). 132

or charutz - ["charutz" is juxtaposed with "broken"] It is similar to "broken," i.e., just as "broken" refers to bone, so "charutz" refers to bone (*Ibid.* 41a).¹³³

or yabeleth - This is [nominal, i.e.,] an animal with warts [and not adjectival, i.e., a warty limb] (Torath Cohanim). 134

you shall not present - What is the intent of this? If to designate [animals with blemishes] as sacred, this is already stated above (20)! How, then, are we to understand: "you shall not present"? You shall not slaughter (*Temurah* 6b). 135

you shall not present these to the L-rd - "These" you shall not present, but you may present animals designated as sacred with which work was done [in contradistinction to the instance of the red heifer, where work invalidates, but a blemish does not] (Sotah 46a). 136

and a fire-offering you shall not make of them, etc. - This refers to the smoking of the fats [of a blemished animal]. Whence is [the prohibition against the smoking of] part of the fats derived? From: "of them." "to the L-rd" — to include [in the prohibition of a blemished animal] the sent-away he-goat [of Yom Kippur, where "to the L-rd" is likewise written] (Yoma 63b). 137, 138

22:23 And an ox or a lamb, *sarua* or *kalut*, a gift you may make it, and as a vow it shall not be accepted.

And an ox or a lamb - Whence is it derived that all of the blemishes of an ox or a lamb render them unacceptable [as an offering]? From: "And an ox or a lamb, sarua or kalut... and as a vow it shall not be accepted." This teaches us that all of the blemishes of an ox or a lamb render them unacceptable (Chullin 80b).¹³⁹

sarua - "sarua" — an animal whose thigh has come out of joint; "kalut" — one whose hooves are fused [and not split], as those of an ass or a horse (Bechoroth 40a). 140

a gift you may make it - It was taught: One who designates unblemished animals for Temple maintenance transgresses a positive commandment, it being written: "a gift you may make it" — you may designate it [i.e.,

a blemished animal] as a gift for Temple maintenance, but you may not designate unblemished animals for Temple maintenance. And a negative transgression derived from a positive commandment is regarded as a positive commandment (*Temurah* 7b).¹⁴¹

a gift you may make it, etc. - This refers to dedication for Temple maintenance. This tells me only that it may be given as a gift. Whence do I derive that it may also be the object of a vow? From: "and as a vow." I might think that it may be vowed even to the altar [i.e., as an offering]; it is, therefore, written: "and as a vow it shall not be accepted" — this [i.e., "acceptance"] refers to altar offerings. This tells me only of [the unacceptability] of vows [for the altar]. Whence do I derive the same for free-will offerings? From: "a gift" [... "shall not be accepted"] (Ibid.). 142-144

and as a vow it shall not be accepted - It was taught: If one dedicates a blemished animal to the altar, what is done is done, it being written: "and as a vow it shall not be accepted" — it is not acceptable, but it assumes sanctified status [and must be redeemed] (*Ibid.* 5b). 145

22:24 And one [whose testicles are] bruised, or crushed, or torn, or cut, you shall not present to the L-rd; and in your land you shall not do this.

And one bruised, or crushed, or torn, or cut - It was taught: All of these refer to the organ and to the testicles (Kiddushin 25b). 146

or torn, or cut - It was taught: There is liability for "emasculation following emasculation," it being written: "or torn, or cut." Now if one is liable for cutting [partially], is it not obvious that he is liable for tearing [completely]! [The intent must be, then,] to impose liability for tearing after cutting (Shabbath 111a).¹⁴⁷

you shall not present - What is the intent of this? It is needed to prohibit the sprinkling of the blood [of blemished animals — see commentary on 22:20] (*Temurah* 7a).¹⁴⁸

and in your land you shall not do this - It was taught: Whence is it derived that emasculation of human beings is forbidden? From: "and in

your land you shall not do this" — to all in your land you shall not do this (Shabbath 110b). 149

and in your land you shall not do this - Ben Zoma was asked: Is it permitted to emasculate a dog? He answered: It is written: "and in your land you shall not do this" — to all in your land you shall not do this (Chagigah 14b). 150

and in your land you shall not do this - This tells me only of "your land." Whence do we derive that the halachah also applies outside of Eretz Yisrael? From: "you shall not do this" (Torath Cohanim). 151

and in your land you shall not do this - This tells me only of a beast. Whence do I derive the same for an animal or a bird? From: "and in your land you shall not do this" [— to all in your land you shall not do this] (Ibid.). 152

you shall not do this - This tells us only of unblemished animals. Whence do we derive that blemished ones are included in the halachah? From: "you shall not do this" (*Ibid.*). 153

22:25 And from the hand of a gentile you shall not present the bread of your G-d of all these, for their corruption is in them; their blemish is in them; they will not be acceptable for you.

And from the hand of a gentile, etc. - What is the intent of this? We might think that since the sons of Noah were not commanded [against offering up animals with blemishes], but only those lacking limbs, therefore, their altar or our altar makes no difference in this regard; it is, therefore, written otherwise (Temuarh 7a). 154,155

the bread of your G-d - It was taught: Whence is it derived that shekalim [coins for communal offerings] are not accepted from idolators? From: "And from the hand of a gentile you shall not present the bread of your G-d." This tells me only of daily offerings, which are called "bread." Whence do I derive the same for the other communal offerings? From: "of all these" (Torath Cohanim). 156,157

of all these - Of all these [blemished animals] you shall not present, but

you may present consecrated animals with which work was performed (Sotah 46a). 158

of all these - Of all these you shall not present, but you may take animals from idolators to present as daily offerings [without apprehension that they may have been objects of sodomy] (Yerushalmi Avodah Zarah 2:1).¹⁵⁹

for their corruption is in them - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael. Wherever "corruption" is mentioned, the referent is always either illicit relations or idol worship. Illicit relations — as it is written (Genesis 5:12): "for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth"; idol worship — as it is written (Deuteronomy 4:16): "lest you become corrupt and make yourselves an image." And it is written here: "for their corruption is in them; their blemish is in them." This teaches us that all [i.e., every animal] that is disqualified by a blemish is likewise disqualified by [being the object of] illicit relations and idol worship (Temurah 28b). 160

for their corruption is in them - It was taught: R. Yehudah says: "for their corruption is in *them*" [masculine] — this teaches us that females are not subject to the interdiction of sterilization (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁶¹

their blemish is in them - When their blemish is in them, they are not acceptable, but if the blemish passes, they are acceptable (Yoma 64a). 162

- 22:26 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 22:27 An ox, or a sheep, or a goat, when it is born, shall be seven days under its mother; and from the eighth day and on, it shall be acceptable as an offering of fire to the L-rd.

An ox, or a sheep, or a goat - "an ox or a sheep" — to exclude a hybrid; "or a goat" — to exclude a nidmeh [a sheep which looks like a goat, or vice-versa] (Chullin 38b). 163

when it is born - Rava said: "An ox, or a sheep, or a goat, when it is born" — from here it is derived that a one-day old ox is called an "ox" [This has various halachic implications] (Bava Kamma 65b). 164

when it is born - to exclude one delivered by Caesarean section (Chullin 38b). 165

shall be seven days - R. Aptoriki queried: It is written: "and it shall be seven days under its mother," the implication being that it is acceptable as an offering on the eve of the eighth day"; but then the verse continues: "and from the eighth day and on it shall be acceptable," implying that on the eve of the eighth day it is not aceptable! How is this to be reconciled? On the eve of the eighth day it is acceptable [for consecration], and on the eighth day itself, for offering (Zevachim 12a). 166

seven days - to exclude [acceptability] before that time (Chullin 38b). 167

it shall be under its mother - to exclude an orphaned animal (Ibid.). 168

under its mother - It is written here: "under," and, in respect to ma'aser [tithes], (Leviticus 27:32): "under the staff." Just as there, a treifah [organically defective animal] is excluded; here, too, it is excluded (Bechoroth 57b). 169

under its mother - The offspring of consecrated animals are not to nurse from consecrated animals. Why so? It is derived: "its mother" [here] - "its mother," in respect to the first-born [Just as there, it is forbidden to derive benefit from the first-born; here, too, it is forbidden to derive benefit from consecrated animals] (Me'ilah 13a). 170

under its mother - I might think that [it is acceptable] even if it left the mother's womb after she had died; it is, therefore, written (*Exodus* 22:29): "seven days it shall be with its mother" [implying that they must be alive together]. If: "with its mother," I might think that it would have to be with its mother all seven days; it is, therefore, written: "under its mother" [negating (in the Hebrew) the above assumption]. How is this to be reconciled? Even if the mother survives for only one moment [after its birth, it is acceptable] (Torath Cohanim).¹⁷¹

and from the eighth day - It was taught: R. Shimon b. Gamliel says: The offspring of a beast that survives for eight days is [thereby] known not to be a miscarriage, for it is written: "and from the eighth day and on it shall be acceptable as an offering" (Shabbath 135b).¹⁷²

and from the eighth day - It was taught: One who offers up an animal before the proper time [i.e., the eighth day] does not receive stripes. Why so? For it is written: "and from the eighth day and on it shall be acceptable" — from the eighth day, it is acceptable; before that time, it is not. And a negative commandment derived from a positive one is regarded as a positive one [transgression of which is not punishable by stripes] (Chullin 81a).¹⁷³

and from the eighth day and on - I might think that on the eighth day itself it is forbidden; it is, therefore, written in respect to the first-born (*Exodus* 22:29): "On the eighth day you shall give it to Me." Just as there, on the eighth day itself [it is permitted]; here, too, on the eighth day itself (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁷⁴

it shall be acceptable as an offering of fire - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one should not consecrate an animal before its time [for offering, i.e., before it is eight days old]? From: "as an offering." [And whence is it derived that he should not place any of it upon the fire of the wood-pile?] From: "of fire" — these [i.e., those over eight days old] are fire-offerings (Yoma 63b). 175,176

as an offering of fire to the L-rd - to include the sent-away he-goat [of Yom Kippur (in respect to which "the L-rd" is, likewise, written)] as forbidden to be brought before its time [i.e., eight days] (*Ibid.*).¹⁷⁷

22:28 And an ox or a sheep, it and its son you shall not slaughter in one day.

And an ox or a sheep - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the halachah of "it and its son" applies also to consecrated animals? From: "And an ox or a sheep, or a goat, when it is born" [which speaks of consecrated animals] followed by: "And an ox or a sheep, it and its son you shall not slaughter in one day." But in that case, perhaps the halachah applies only to consecrated animals and not to unconsecrated ones! [This is not so, for] "ox" [i.e., "And an ox"] interrupts the previous subject [of consecration] (Chullin 78a). 178,179

And an ox or a sheep - It was taught: "it and its son" applies also to

hybrid animals, it being written: "or" to include the hybrid variety (*Ibid.*). 180

And an ox or a sheep - "it and its son" applies only to beasts alone [as opposed to "animals"], it being written: "And an ox or a sheep, it and its son you shall not slaughter in one day" — "an ox," and not an animal; "a sheep," and not birds (Torath Cohanim). 181

it and its son - The Rabbis taught: I might think that one is not liable for "it and its son" until he slaughters an ox and a sheep and its son; it is, therefore, written: "it and its son," though he not slaughter an ox and a sheep and its son (Chullin 78b). 182

it and its son - It was taught: I might think that "it and its son" applied both to males [i.e., the father animal and his child] and females [the mother animal and her child]; it is, therefore, written: "it" — one, and not both. But I still would not know which one. I, therefore, derive it, viz.: There is liability here, and there is liability for taking the fledglings in the presence of the mother bird. Just as there, the halachah applies to females [the mother bird] and not males; here, too, it applies to females and not males (Ibid.).¹⁸³

it and its son, etc. - R. Chisda said: All agree that if the mother is a deer, and her son, a he-goat, there is no liability for "it and its son." Why so? Scripture writes: "a sheep... and its son," and not: "a deer and its son" (*Ibid.* 79b).¹⁸⁴

it and its son - R. Chisda said: All agree that if the mother is a she-goat, and her son, a deer, there is liability for "it and its son." Why so? Scripture writes: "a sheep" [i.e., the mother must be a beast, as opposed to an animal] and its son" — whatever that son be [even an animal] (Ibid.). 185

it and its son - This tells me only of it and its son. Whence do I derive the same for it and its mother? [i.e., Whence do I derive that if one slaughtered an animal, and another came and slaughtered its mother, and a third, and slaughtered its son (on the same day) — whence do I derive that both (the second and the third slaughterers) are liable?] From: "You [plural] shall not slaughter," implying both [as in the above-stated instance] (*Ibid.* 82a). 186

you shall not slaughter - If one stabs an animal or rips out [what should be severed by slaughtering] he is not liable [if he then slaughters the son] for "it and its son." Why so? For it is written: "you shall not slaughter," and this [i.e., the first] is not slaughtering (Ibid. 81b).¹⁸⁷

you shall not slaughter - One who slaughters and finds the animal to be treifah [organically defective], one who slaughters for idol-worship, one who slaughters the red heifer, or an ox that is to be stoned, or the calf whose neck is to be broken — all of these are liable for "it and its son." Why so? It is derived: "slaughtering" [here] - "slaughtering," in respect to the slaughtering of consecrated animals outside [of the azarah]. Just as there, slaughtering which does not validate the animal is still called "slaughtering"; here, too, though the slaughtering does not validate the animal, it is still called "slaughtering" (Ibid. 85a). 188

in one day - In respect to the creation, it is written (Genesis 1:5): "one day," and, in respect to "it and its son," "one day." Just as with the "one day" of creation, the day begins with the preceding night, so with the "one day" of "it and its son," the day begins with the preceding night (Ibid. 83a). 189

in one day - It was taught: Rebbi says: "one day" — [the connotation is] a "unique" day. From here it was derived that one who sells an animal during four special times of the year [the eves of: the last day of the festival of Succoth, the first day of Pesach, Shevuoth, and Rosh Hashanah (when much slaughtering is done)] — one who sells an animal then must inform the buyer [if he has sold the mother or the son on the same day, so that "it and its son" not be inadvertently transgressed] (Ibid. b). 190,191

22:29 And when you sacrifice a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the L-rd, with your acceptance shall you sacrifice it.

a sacrifice of thanksgiving - This tells us only of a thanksgiving offering. Whence do we derive that all offerings that are to be eaten in one day are to be sacrificed with the intent of eating them in one day? From: "a sacrifice [generic] of thanksgiving" (Torath Cohanim). 192

22:30 On that day it shall be eaten. You shall not leave over from it until morning; I am the L-rd.

On that day it shall be eaten - What is the intent of this? [If to tell us about eating per se, this has already been stated (in Tsav)]. If it is not to be understood as referring to eating per se, understand it as referring to slaughtering, i.e., the very beginning of the slaughtering should be with the intention of eating it in one day (*Ibid*.). 193

22:31 And you shall heed My mitzvoth and you shall do them; I am the L-rd.

And you shall heed them...and you shall do them - "And you shall heed them" — this refers to *Mishnah* [i.e., learning]; "and you shall do them" — this refers to performance [of the *mitzvoth*]. This teaches us that all who are not in learning are not in doing (*Ibid.*). 194

22:32 And you shall not profane My holy name, that I may be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel; I am the L-rd who sanctifies you.

that I may be sanctified, etc. - R. Adda b. Ahavah asked: Whence is it derived that one praying alone does not recite the *Kedushah* ["sanctification"] prayer? From: "that I may be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel." How is it inferred from here? It is derived: "the midst" — "the midst." It is written here: "that I may be sanctified in *the midst* of the children of Israel," and elsewhere (*Numbers* 16:21): "Separate yourselves from *the midst* of this congregation." Just as there, *ten* [a "congregation" being no less than ten]; here, too, there must be [at least] ten (*Berachoth* 21b). 195, 196

that I may be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel - It is written here: "in the midst of the children of Israel," and, elsewhere (Genesis 42:5): "And the children of Israel [i.e., Jacob] came... in the midst of those who came." Just as there, the "children of Israel" are ten; here, too, the "children of Israel" are ten [From here it is derived that a formula of Kedushah [sanctification] is not recited with fewer than ten (Yerushalmi Berachoth 7:3). 197

that I may be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel - see commentary on Leviticus 18:5

in the midst of the children of Israel - R. Yaakov said in the name of R. Yochanan: There is no "public" with fewer than ten. Obviously, Jews are required, for it is written: "that I be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel." But if there were nine Jews and one gentile, is this sufficient? Come and hear: It is written here: "in the midst of the children of Israel," and, elsewhere (Numbers 16:21): "Separate yourselves from the midst of this congregation." Just as there, ten Jews; here, too, [there must be] ten Jews (Sanhedrin 74b). 198

in the midst of the children of Israel - From here it is derived that the children of Israel are commanded to sanctify the Name, but the sons of Noah are not commanded to do so (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 4:3). 199

22:33 Who took you out of the land of Egypt to be your G-d; I am the L-rd.

Who took you out, etc.-[What is the intent of this?] It is on a condition that I took you out of Egypt — that you dedicate yourselves to the sanctification of My name (Torath Cohanim).²⁰⁰

- 23:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 23:2 Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: The festivals of the L-rd, which you shall call (them) callings of holiness these are My festivals.

Speak to the children of Israel - Here it speaks of the intercalation of a year, and, below (4) of the intercalation of a month (*Torath Cohanim* [4]).

Speak to the children of Israel - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the year is intercalated for the sake of those living in exile, who left their places and have not yet reached Jerusalem [for the festival]? From: "Speak to the children of Israel... The festivals of the L-rd" — arrange

the festivals so that they can be observed by all Jews (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 10:1).²

which you shall call them - It was taught: How is the New Moon sanctified [i.e., declared]? The head of the beth-din says: "It is sanctified," and all the people answer after him: "It is sanctified; it is sanctified." Whence is this derived? R. Pappa answered: "which you shall call them" ["otham"] — read it ["atem" (i.e., "you" — you declare the New Moon)]. R. Nachman b. Yitzchak said: "these ["hem"] are My festivals" — they [also, "hem"] shall declare My festivals. And why do they say: "it is sanctified; it is sanctified," twice? Because it is written: "callings of holiness" (Rosh Hashanah 24a).³⁻⁵

callings of holiness - see below (35)

callings of holiness - The Rabbis taught (Exodus 19:8): "Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it": What is the intent of "to sanctify it"? Sanctify it with benediction. From here it was derived: It is sanctified with wine upon its entrance. This tells me only of the Sabbath. Whence do I derive the same for festivals? From: "These are the festivals of the L-rd [which you shall call, etc."] (Mechilta Yithro).6

these are My festivals - It was taught: I might think that if the New Moon were declared one day before its time [i.e., before the actual appearance of the new moon] or one day after the intercalatory phase, that it would be [halachically] intercalated; it is, therefore, written: "which you shall call them — these are My festivals" — ["them," i.e.,] in their proper times, they are My festivals; before their proper times, they are not My festivals (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 10:1).

23:3 Six days shall work be done, and on the seventh day is a Sabbath of resting, a calling of holiness. All work you shall not do; it is Sabbath to the L-rd in all of your dwellings.

Six days, etc. - What does the Sabbath have to do with the section on festivals? [It is mentioned] to teach us that all who desecrate the festivals are considered as having desecrated the Sabbaths, and that one

who keeps the festivals is considered to have kept the Sabbaths (Torath Cohanim).⁸

it is Sabbath - What is the intent of this? To make one liable for violation of each Sabbath [in an instance where he unknowingly violates several Sabbaths in a row] (Yerushalmi Shabbath 7:1).9

it is Sabbath to the L-rd - It was taught: One verse states: "it is Sabbath to the L-rd" [implying that it should be dedicated entirely to spiritual pursuits], and another (*Numbers* 29:35): "It shall be an assembly for you" [implying for your pleasures]! Give a portion to the Torah, and a portion to eating and drinking (*Ibid.* 15:3).¹⁰

in all of your dwellings - Why does Scripture mention "dwellings" in respect to Sabbath? I might think that since the Sabbath is mentioned in the context of festivals it requires declaration by beth-din [in Eretz Yisrael] as festivals do; it is, therefore, written otherwise [i.e., "in all of your dwellings" — wherever they happen to be] (Kiddushin 37b). 11,12

23:4 These are the festivals of the L-rd, callings of holiness, which you shall call (them) in their proper times.

These are the festivals of the L-rd - R. Krispi said in the name of R. Yochanan: In the past — "These are the festivals of the L-rd" [i.e., fixed in time by G-d]; from this time on — "which you shall call them" [i.e., the time is to be declared by you] (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:3).¹³

which you shall call them - For two months [Nissan and Tishrei] the Sabbath is desecrated [i.e., beth-din sends messengers even outside the Sabbath boundary to declare the New Moon], it being written: "These are the festivals of the L-rd... which you shall call (them) in their proper times." I might think that just as the Sabbath may be desecrated to declare them, so it may be desecrated to consecrate them; it is, therefore, written: "which you call them" — for their "calling" [i.e., declaration] you may desecrate the Sabbath, but not for their confirmation (Rosh Hashanah 21b). 14-16

which you shall call them - One who saw the new moon on Sabbath and is unable to walk is transported on a doneky — even in bed — so that he

can come to [beth-din] to testify as to his observation, it being written: "These are the festivals of the L-rd... which you shall call them in their proper times" (Ibid. 22a).¹⁷

which you shall call them - It was taught: It is written [i.e., the word "them," "otham," may be read]: "atem" [i.e., "you"], "atem," "atem," three times, to teach [that the ultimate decisor of the New Moon is "you" [i.e., beth-din], even [if you intercalated the New Moon] by error; "you," even by deliberate intent [not coinciding with the true time]; "you," even if you were misled [by false witnesses] (Ibid.). 18,19

which you shall call them - R. Illa said: [It is written: "atem" (see above)] to teach that if you ["atem"] declare them, they are My festivals; and if not, they are not My festivals (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:3).20

- 23:5 In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, at twilight, it is Pesach to the L-rd.
- 23:6 And on the fifteenth day of this month is the festival of matzoth to the L-rd. Seven days shall you eat matzoth.

the festival of matzoth - It was taught: "And on the fifthteenth day of this month is the festival of matzoth to the L-rd." This day requires matzoth, but the festival of Succoth does not require matzoth. Now should it not follow otherwise a fortiori [that Succoth does require matzoth], viz.: If Pesach, which does not require a succah [i.e., a booth] requires matzoth, should not Succoth, which does require a succah, most definitely require matzoh! For this reason [i.e., to countermand this argument] it is written: "of this month" — this [i.e., Pesach] requires matzoh, but Succoth does not require matzoh (Torath Cohanim).²¹

On the first day, a calling of holiness it shall be for you; all manner of work you shall not do.

- 23:8 And you shall present a fire-offering to the L-rd for seven days. On the seventh day is a calling of holiness; all manner of work you shall not do.
- a fire-offering to the L-rd for seven days There are no seven days without Sabbath [This teaches us that the additional offerings of the festival override the Sabbath] (Yerushalmi Succah 3:11).²²
- a fire-offering to the L-rd for seven days It was taught: Whence is it derived that if there are no bullocks, rams are brought; if there are no rams, bullocks are brought; if they are not clean, they bring them in a state of uncleanliness? From: "And you shall present a fire-offering to the L-rd for seven days" in any event (Torath Cohanim).²³
- 23:9 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saving:
- 23:10 Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: When you come to the land which I give to you and you reap its harvest, you shall bring the *omer* [one-tenth of an *ephah*] of the first of your harvest to the priest.

When you come, etc. - It was taught: R. Yehudah said in the name of R. Akiva: Why did Scripture dictate the bringing of the *omer* on Pesach? Because Pesach is the time of [judgment upon] grain. The Holy One Blessed be He said: Bring *omer* before me on Pesach so that the grain in the fields will be blessed for you (Rosh Hashanah 16a).²⁴

and you reap - And it is written: "you shall bring the *omer* of the first of your harvest to the priest, and he shall lift" — this teaches us that there is no mitzvah of reaping for the priest (Torath Cohanim).²⁵

and you reap, etc. - It was taught: R. Binyamin says: One verse states; "and you reap its harvest and you shall bring the omer" [implying that there may be harvesting before that of the omer], and another: "the first of your harvest to the priest"! How is this to be reconciled? From the place that you may bring the omer you may not harvest [before the omer harvest]; from the place that you may not bring the omer [e.g.,

parched fields, requiring irrigation], you may harvest (Menachoth 71a). 26,27

its harvest - The *omer* is brought only from [the grain of] Eretz Yisrael, it being written: "When you come to the land...and you reap *its* harvest" (*Ibid.* 83b).²⁸

its harvest - "harvest," and not pulse; "harvest," and not fodder-corn (Torath Cohanim).²⁹

the first of your harvest - It was taught: Wheat, barley, spelt, fox-tail oats, and rye may not be harvested before the *omer*. Whence is this derived? R. Yochanan said: It is derived: "first" [here]- "first," in respect to *challah* [where these five varieties are alluded to] (*Menachoth* 70b).³⁰

the first of your harvest - It was taught: The *omer* is brought only of the new produce, as it is written: "the first of your harvest" (*Ibid.* 84a).³¹

your harvest - It shall be yours. This teaches us that it is permitted to derive benefit from the new harvest [before the omer is brought, though it may not be eaten before that time] (Pesachim 23a).³²

your harvest - "your harvest," and not that of idolators. This teaches us that the omer is not brought of grain that grew [while the land was] in the possession of idolators (Rosh Hashanah 13a).³³

your harvest - It is permitted to harvest [before the *omer* harvest] for the sake of plants [that they not be destroyed by the grain pressing upon them] and to clear a place for the convening of mourners or for the study of Torah. Whence is this derived? Scripture writes: "your harvest" [i.e., the first harvest which is for you must be the omer], and not a harvest for mitzvah [i.e., such a harvest may precede that of the omer] (Menachoth 72a).³⁴⁻³⁶

23:11 And he shall lift the *omer* before the L-rd, as is acceptable to you; on the morrow of the Sabbath the priest shall lift it.

as is acceptable to you - This teaches us that the people are not coerced to do this (*Torath Cohanim*).³⁷

the priest shall lift it - What is the intent of this? [i.e., It has just been stated!] This is the prototype for all "liftings" to be done by the priest (*Ibid.*).³⁸

23:12 And you shall offer, on the day that you lift the *omer*, an unblemished one-year old lamb, as a burnt-offering to the L-rd.

And you shall offer, etc. - This teaches us that the lamb is offered though there be no *omer*, and that the *omer* is brought though there be no lamb (*Ibid.*).³⁹

on the day that you lift - This teaches us that the entire day is acceptable for lifting (Megillah 20b).40

23:13 And its meal-offering, two-tenths of fine flour mixed with oil, a fire-offering to the L-rd, a sweet savor; and its drink-offering, wine, a fourth of a hin.

And its meal-offering, two-tenths - The Rabbis taught: "And its meal-offering, two-tenths." This teaches us that the meal-offering of the lamb which accompanies the *omer* is twice [the normal amount (one-tenth)]. I might think that the wine, too, is twice the normal amount; it is, therefore, written [to dispel this notion]: "and its drink-offering, wine, a fourth of a hin [that is, the normal amount] (Menachoth 89b). 41,42

and its drink-offering - It is written: "venishkah" ["its (feminine, i.e., the meal-offering's) drink-offering (oil)"], yet pronounced "venisko" ["its (masculine, i.e., the lamb's) drink-offering (wine)"] to teach that the drink-offering of the meal-offering is as that of the wine. Just as that of the wine is a quarter of a hin, so is that of the oil a quarter of a hin (Ibid.).⁴³

23:14 And bread, and parched grain, and fresh ears you shall

not eat until this self-same day, until you have brought the offering of your G-d; a statute forever, throughout your generations, in all of your dwellings.

And bread - The new produce of wheat, barley, spelt, fox-tail oats, and rye is forbidden before Pesach. Whence is this derived? Resh Lakish said: It is derived: "bread" [here] - "bread," in respect to matzoh. Just as "bread" there signifies these five varieties, so, "bread" here signifies the same (Ibid. 70b).44

And bread and parched grain - Parched grain is being likened to bread. What imposes liability for "first produce" because of "bread" [i.e., one of the five varieties mentioned above] imposes it, likewise, because of its parched grain; and what does not impose such liability because of "bread" does not impose it because of its parched grain (Yerushalmi Challah 1:1).45

And bread, and parched grain, and fresh ears - R. Yitzchak said: If one eats bread, and parched grain, and fresh ears before the bringing of the *omer* he receives stripes three times. And though stripes are, as a rule, not administered for [the distinct components of] a comprehensive neagive commandment, it is different here, for Scripture stated them [i.e., "parched grain and fresh ears"] superfluously [to the end of imposing such distinct liability ("grain" and "ears" being subsumed in "bread") (Krituth 5a).46

until this self-same day - until the day [the sixteenth day of Nissan] itself [and not just until its first light], and including the [entire] day (Menachoth 68b).⁴⁷

in all of your dwellings - It was taught: R. Eliezer says: "in all of your dwellings" — wherever you dwell [even outside of Eretz Yisrael]; and the Rabbis say: "in all of your dwellings" — after you have inherited and dwelt in the land [but not when you are in the process of conquering it] (Kiddushin 37a).48

23:15 And you shall count for yourselves from the morrow of the Sabbath, from the day that you bring the *omer* of the lifting; seven complete Sabbaths shall they be.

And you shall count for yourselves - The Rabbis taught: "And you shall count for yourselves" — each one shall count for himself individually (Menachoth 65b).⁴⁹

from the morrow of the Sabbath - What is the intent of: "from the morrow of the Sabbath"? On the morrow of the festival [of Pesach, i.e., on the sixteenth day of Nissan] or on the morrow of the [literal] genesis Sabbath? R. Yehudah b. Betheira said: It is written here: "Sabbath," and, further (16): "Sabbath," viz.: "Until the morrow of the seventh Sabbath." Just as there, the reference is to a time period [i.e., the end of the seventh week] conjoined with the beginning of a festival [Shevuoth]; here, too, the reference is to a time period [the omer] conjoined with the beginning of a festival [Pesach, which begins with the fifteenth day of Nissan] (Ibid.). 50,51

from the day that you bring the omer of the lifting - It was taught: I might think that one can harvest and bring the *omer*, and count whenever he likes; it is, therefore, written (*Deuteronomy* 16:9): "from the time you put the sickle to the standing grain you shall begin to count." If: "from the time you put the sickle," I might think that one could harvest and count, and bring the *omer* whenever he liked; it is, therefore, written: "from the day that you bring" (*Ibid.* 66a). 52

from the day that you bring - It was taught: If: "from the day," I might think that he harvests and counts and brings the *omer* in the daytime; it is, therefore, written: "seven complete Sabbaths shall they be" [and there is no "completeness" without the night]. If: "complete," I might think that he harvests, and brings, and counts at night; it is, therefore, written: "from the *day* that you bring." How is this realized? The harvesting and counting is at night, and the bringing in the daytime (*Ibid.* 66a). 53,54

23:16 Until the morrow of the seventh Sabbath shall you count fifty days, and you shall offer a new meal-offering to the L-rd.

shall you count fifty days - Abbaye said: It is a mitzvah to count days, and it is a mitzvah to count weeks. It is a mitzvah to count days, as it is written: "shall you count fifty days"; and it is a mitzvah to count weeks,

as it is written (*Deuteronomy* 16:9): "Seven weeks shall you count for yourself" (*Chagigah* 17b).⁵⁵

shall you count fifty days - It was taught: I might think that one should count fifty days and make the fifty-first the festival [of Shevuoth]; it is, therefore, written (15): "seven complete Sabbaths shall they be." [In that case] I might think that he should count forty-eight days and make the forty-ninth the festival; it is, therefore, written: "shall you count fifty days." How is this realized? Count forty-nine days and make the fiftieth day the festival, as with the Jubilee year (Torath Cohanim).

and you shall offer a new meal-offering - [Which meal-offering is being spoken of? The two loaves.] From here it is derived that the two loaves come only from the new grain (Menachoth 83).⁵⁷

23:17 From your dwellings shall you bring two breads of lifting.

Two tenths of fine flour shall they be. Of leaven shall they be baked, first fruits to the L-rd.

From your dwellings shall you bring - "From your dwellings" — and not from outside Eretz Yisrael; "shall you bring" — and even from the attic [i.e., from old grain if no new grain is available] (*Ibid.*).⁵⁸

From your dwellings shall you bring - "shall you bring" — to include all other bringings of this nature as requiring this measure, viz.: Just as here, one-tenth to a loaf, so, elsewhere, one-tenth to a loaf. But if so, why not say: just as here two-tenths [in sum total], so, elsewhere two-tenths [in sum total]? [To offset this] it is written: "shall they be" (Ibid. 77b). 59,60

two breads of lifting - It was taught: R. Yehudah said in the name of R. Akiva: Why did Scripture prescribe the bringing of two breads on Shevuoth? For Shevuoth is the time [of judgment] for the fruits of the tree; so that the Holy One Blessed be He says (as it were): Bring two breads so that the fruits of the tree of this year [the wheat plant, in this context, being considered a tree] will be blessed for you (Rosh Hashanah 16a).⁶¹

two breads of lifting - They should look alike; "Two tenths" — they should be similar (*Torath Cohanim*).62

shall they be - The two loaves of the show - bread are mutually indispensable. How do we know this? "Being" [i.e., "shall they be" (implying that they must both be there)] is stated in relation to them (Menachoth 27a).⁶³

first fruits to the L-rd - Scripture likened them to bikkurim [the first-fruits]. Just as bikkurim come alone, so the two loaves come alone [i.e., even if no lambs are available]; and just as bikkurim are eaten, so the two loaves are eaten (Ibid. 46b).^{64,65}

first fruits to the L-rd - It was taught: R. Shimon says: It is written here: "first fruits to the L-rd," and, elsewhere (2:14): "first fruits to the L-rd." Just as the "first fruits" mentioned there are a communal offering, so, "first fruits" here are a communal offering (*Torath Cohanim*).66

23:18 And you shall present with the bread seven unblemished one-year old lambs, and one young bullock, and two rams. They shall be a burnt-offering to the L-rd, with their meal-offering and their drink-offerings, a fire-offering, a sweet savor to the L-rd.

seven lambs - It was taught: R. Akiva says: I might think that the lambs mentioned here are the same as those mentioned in the *Book of Numbers* (28:27); but when we come to bullocks and rams we find that this is not so [for here we have one bullock and two rams, and there, two bullocks and one ram]. It must be, then, that each comes for its own purpose, the offering referred to in the *Book of Numbers*, [which is not accompanied by bread] being sacrificed in the desert, and that referred to in *Leviticus* [which is accompanied by the bread of the land] not being offered in the desert (*Menachoth* 45b).^{67,68}

23:19 And you shall offer one kid of the goats as a sin-offering and two one-year old lambs as a sacrifice of peace-offerings.

and two lambs - [The two lambs of Shevuoth,] which are communal peace-offerings, are eaten only by the males of the priesthood, it being written here: "one kid of the goats as a sin-offering." Just as a sin-offering is eaten by the males of the priesthood, so communal peace-offerings are eaten by the males of the priesthood (Zevachim 55a).⁶⁹

as a sacrifice of peace-offerings - What is the intent of: "as a sacrifice"? They must be sacrificed expressly as peace-offerings (*Torath Cohanim*).70

23:20 And the priest shall lift them on the bread of the first fruits, a lifting before the L-rd, on the two lambs. Holy shall they be to the L-rd to the priest.

And the priest shall lift them, etc. - It was taught: I might think that he places the devoted portions of the lambs atop the bread and lifts; it is, therefore, written: "on the two lambs." [In that case] I might think that he places the bread atop the lambs; it is, therefore, written: "on the bread." How is this to be reconciled? Rebbi answered: He places one beside the other and lifts [the word "on" in Hebrew being susceptible of the signification "with"] (Menachoth 62a).⁷¹

Holy shall they be - The two lambs of the Shevuoth offering are mutually indispensable. How do we know this? "Being" [i.e., "shall they be" (implying that they must both be there)] is stated in relation to them (*Ibid.* 27a). ⁷²

to the L-rd to the priest - It was taught: R. Akiva says: The bread is indispensable for the lambs [to be offered], but the lambs are not indispensable for the bread. Whence is this derived? From: "Holy shall they be to the L-rd to the priest." What is it that is *all* to the priest? The bread (*Ibid.* 45b).⁷³

23:21 And you shall call out on this self-same day; a holy calling shall there be for you. All manner of work you shall not do, a statute forever, in all of your dwellings, throughout your generations.

And you shall call, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the Shevuoth offering [if it were not brought on Shevuoth] may be presented all seven [days after the festival]? From: "And you shall call...(22) And when you harvest." On which festival do you "call" and harvest? Shevuoth. Now when can this be? If on the festival itself, is it permitted to harvest on the festival! It must be then for compensation [i.e., to tell us that compensation for the missed offering can be made on "harvesting" days (i.e., working days after the festival)] (Chagigah 17b). ^{74,75}

23:22 And when you harvest the harvest of your land, do not end off the corner of your field in your reaping; and the gleaning of your harvest you shall not gather. To the poor and to the stranger you shall leave them; I am the L-rd your G-d.

And when you harvest - Why does Scripture interject this in the middle of [the laws of] the festivals? To teach that all who perform the mitzvoth of leket, shikchah, peah, and ma'aser ani [i.e., those mitzvoth alluded to in the above verse] are regarded as offering sacrifices within the Temple [as is done on the festivals]; and all who do not perform these mitzvoth are regarded as withholding sacrifices from the Temple (Torath Cohanim). 76,77

- 23:23 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 23:24 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: On the seventh month, on the first day of the month, there shall be for you a Sabbath, a remembrance of *teruah* [blowing with the shofar], a holy calling.

On the seventh month - It was taught: Rebbi says: Whence is it derived that "Malchiyoth" [exaltations of G-d, the King] are recited on Rosh Hashanah? From (22): "I am the L-rd, your G-d," followed by: "On the seventh month" [Tishrei, the month of Rosh Hashanah] (Rosh Hashanah 32a).⁷⁸

On the seventh month - It was taught: It is written here: "On the seventh month...a remembrance of teruah," and, in respect to the heralding of the Jubilee year (Leviticus 25:9): "And you shall sound out a shofar blast of teruah in the seventh month," rendering the learnings derived for each reciprocal (Ibid. 34a)."

there shall be for you a Sabbath - "a Sabbath" — Make it holy by refraining from labor (*Ibid.* 32a).⁸⁰

- a remembrance of teruah It was taught: One verse states: "a remembrance of teruah," and, another (Numbers 29:1): "a day of teruah shall there be for you"! [How are the verses to be reconciled?] The first applies to Rosh Hashanah that falls out on the Sabbath [when the shofar is not blown, but "remembered" in verses]; the second applies to Rosh Hashanah that falls out on a weekday (Ibid. 29b). 81
- a remembrance of teruah The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that "Zichronoth" [verses of "remembrance"] and "Shofroth" [verses relating to the shofar] are recited on Rosh Hashanah? R. Akiva said: From: "zichron teruah" ["a remembrance of teruah"]: "zichron"—zichronoth; "teruah" shofroth (Ibid. 32a).82
- a remembrance of teruah It was taught: It is written here: "teruah," and [in relation to the journeyings of the camps] (Numbers 10:6): "teruah." Just as the teruah blast there, has a tekiah blast accompanying it, so, the teruah blast here, has a tekiah blast accompanying it (Ibid. 34a).83
- a remembrance of teruah It was taught: Three "teruoth" were stated in respect to Rosh Hashanah: [here] "a Sabbath, a remembrance of teruah," (Numbers 29:1): "A day of teruah," (Leviticus 25:9): "And you shall sound out a shofar blast of teruah," two [teruah blasts] being ordained by Scripture and one by the Scribes. Why so? [i.e., Why should all three not be considered Scripturally ordained?] "a day of teruah" is written for its own teaching, viz., [that the shofar is to be sounded] in the daytime, and not at night [and thus, Scripturally, it does not ordain an additional teruah blast] (Ibid.).84
- a holy calling What is "a holy calling"? The kiddush [blessing of sanctification] of the day (*Ibid.* 32a).⁸⁵

23:25 All manner of work you shall not do, and you shall offer up a fire-offering to the L-rd.

All manner of work - It was taught in the school of Shmuel: "All manner of work you shall not do" — This excludes the blowing of the shofar and the extraction of the loaf from the oven, these being art and not work (*Ibid.* 29b). 86,87

- 23:26 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 23:27 But on the tenth day of this seventh month it is a day of atonement. A holy calling it shall be for you. And you shall afflict your souls and you shall offer up a fire-offering to the L-rd.

But on the tenth - I might think that Yom Kippur atoned both for those who did and for those who did not repent; it is, therefore, written: "But," to distinguish between the two ["But" having a connotation of limitation] (Shevuoth 13a).88

23:28 And all work, you shall not do on this self-same day; for it is a day of atonement to atone for you before the L-rd your G-d.

on this self-same day - This teaches us that he is exhorted [by negative commandment against labor] on the day of Yom Kippur itself, and he is not thus exhorted against additional labor [i.e., labor in that time period which is added on to the day of Yom Kippur itself "from the profane to the holy"] (Yoma 81a).89

23:29 For every soul which will not be afflicted on this self-same day will be cut off from its people.

which will not be afflicted - It was taught: Since Scripture varied its terminology in respect to Yom Kippur, writing: "which will not be afflicted," [instead of the conventional: "which will eat"], the sages

varied its quantity [i.e., the quantity of food which makes him liable for cutting-off], making it a date [the size of two olives, instead of the usual olive (one being "afflicted" if he cannot eat at least the size of a date)] (*Ibid.* 80a). 90

which will not be afflicted - Resh Lakish said: One who eats "destructively" on Yom Kippur is exempt [from kareth]. Why so? It is written: "which will not be afflicted," which excludes one who causes injury to himself (*Ibid.* b). 91

on this self-same day - This teaches us that there is a penalty of kareth [cutting-off] for [eating upon] the day of Yom Kippur itself, but there is no such penalty for eating in that time period which is added on to it ["from the profane to the holy"] (*Ibid.* 81a).92

23:30 And every soul that shall do any labor on this self-same day, I shall make that soul go lost from the midst of its people.

on this self-same day - This teaches us that there is a penalty of *kareth* for [performance of labor upon] the day itself, but there is no such penalty for labor in that time period which is added on to it (*lbid.*).⁹³

I shall make that soul go lost - From here we learn that "kareth" means a soul's going lost (Torath Cohanim).⁹⁴

I shall make that soul go lost - see commentary on 16:29

23:31 All labor you shall not do, an everlasting statute throughout your generations in all of your dwellings.

All labor you shall not do - Five verses are stated in respect to labor [four negative commandments and one indicating kareth: [here] verses 28, 30, 31, (Ibid. 16:29), (Numbers 29:7)]: one for exhortation [against labor] in the day, one for exhortation [against labor] in the evening, one for the punishment [for labor] in the day, one for punishment [for labor] in the evening, and one for "overlapping," to derive [halachoth concerning] afflication from [those concerning] labor, in respect to both the day and the evening (Yoma 81a). 95,96

23:32 A Sabbath of resting it shall be for you, and you shall afflict your souls; on the ninth day of the month in the evening, from evening until evening, shall you rest your resting.

on the ninth day of the month - Now does one afflict himself on the *ninth* day? Is it not the *tenth* day on which he afflicts himself? The intent of the verse is to teach us that all who eat and drink on the ninth day are looked upon by Scripture as if they had afflicted themselves on the ninth and tenth days (*Berachoth* 8b).⁹⁷

on the ninth day of the month, etc. - I might think on the ninth day itself; it is, therefore, written: "in the evening." If "in the evening," I might think when it became dark; it is, therefore, written: "on the ninth." How is this to be resolved? One begins afflicting himself when it is still light [on the ninth day before the darkness of the tenth sets in]. This teaches us that we add "from the profane to the holy." But this tells us that we thus add to its arrival. Whence do we derive that we add likewise upon its departure? From: "from evening until evening." This tells us only of Yom Kippur. Whence do we derive the same for festivals? From: "your resting" — wherever there is "resting," we add from the profane to the holy (Rosh Hashanah 9a). 98-101

from evening until evening - When R. Zeira came up [to Eretz Yisrael] he said: In proclaiming the New Moon, the night [preceding the day of the New Moon] and the day are regarded as one. Whence is this derived? R. Yochanan said: From: "from evening until evening" (*Ibid.* 20b). 102,103

- 23:33 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 23:34 Speak to the children of Israel, saying: On the fifteenth day of this seventh month is the festival of Succoth, seven days to the L-rd.

On the fifteenth day - It is written here: "On the fifteenth day of the month," and, in respect to the festival of Matzoth (6): "On the fifteenth

day of the month." Just as there, the first night is mandatory [for the eating of matzoth, and the other days, optional], so, here, the first night is mandatory [for dwelling in the succah, and the other days, optional] (Succah 27a). 104

seven days to the L-rd - It was taught: R. Yehudah b. Betheirah says: Just as the name of the L-rd attaches itself to the festival, so does it attach itself to the succah. For it is written: "the festival of Succoth, seven days to the L-rd" — just as the festival is "to the L-rd," so the succah is "to the L-rd." From here it is derived that it is forbidden to derive benefit from the wood of the succah [for secular purposes] all seven days [of the festival] (*Ibid.* 9b). 105

- 23:35 On the first day is a holy calling; all manner of work you shall not do.
- a holy calling Make it holy. How do you make it holy? With [special] food and drink and with fresh clothing (*Torath Cohanim*). 106

all manner of work, etc. - followed by: "Seven days," to teach that work is forbidden on the intermediate days of the festival [chol hamoed] (Chagigah 18a). 107

- 23:36 Seven days shall you present a fire-offering to the L-rd. On the eighth day a holy calling shall there be for you, and you shall present a fire-offering to the L-rd. It is a select day; all manner of work you shall not do.
- 23:37 These are the festivals of the L-rd, which you shall call holy callings to present a fire-offering to the L-rd, a burnt-offering and a meal-offering, a sacrifice and drink-offerings, the object of the day in its day.

These are the festivals of the L-rd - It was taught: R. Akiva said: What is Scripture referring to? If to the first day [of the festival], it is already written in that regard: "a day of rest"; and if to the seventh day, it is already written in that regard: "a day of rest." It must be referring then

to *Chol Hamoed* [the intermediate days of the festival] to teach us that work is forbidden on those days (*Ibid.*). 108

a sacrifice and drink-offerings - Zeiri said: The drink-offerings are consecrated only with the slaughtering of the sacrifice. Whence is this derived? From: "a sacrifice and drink-offerings" (Menachoth 79a).¹⁰⁹

a sacrifice and drink-offerings - R. Ashi said: If a grapevine overhung figs, its wine is invalid for the drink-offerings. Why so? For it is written: "a sacrifice and drink-offerings." Just as the sacrificial offering does not change, so [Scripture requires] drink-offerings which do not change [in flavor] (Bechoroth 17a). 110

the object of the day in its day - This teaches us that the entire day is valid for the additional offerings (*Temurah* 14a).¹¹¹

the object of the day in its day - This teaches us that if the day passed and he did not offer them he is not required to make restitution. I might think that he is likewise not required to make restitution for their [omitted] drink-offerings though he presented the sacrifice itself; it is, therefore, written: "Aside from the Sabbaths of the L-rd" [i.e., you must present any omitted drink-offerings aside from the regular Sabbath offerings] (Ibid.). 112,113

23:38 Aside from the Sabbaths of the L-rd, and aside from your gifts, and aside from all your vows, and aside from all your free-will offerings that you give to the L-rd.

Aside from the Sabbaths of the L-rd - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the additional offerings of the Sabbath are presented together with the devoted portions of the festival [when the Sabbath falls out on a festival?] From: "Aside from the Sabbaths of the L-rd" (Torath Cohanim).114

and aside from your gifts - It was taught: I might think that only the offerings of the festival itself are to be presented on the festival. Whence is it derived that individual offerings and communal offerings consecrated upon the festival are presented on the festival? From: "and aside from your gifts." And it is written further: "that you give to the L-

rd" — these are birds and meal-offerings [which are entirely consumed by fire, and, thus, entirely "to the *L-rd*"] — to include all of them as fit for presentation on the festival (*Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah* 1:1). 115,116

23:39 But on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you gather the produce of the land, you shall celebrate the festival of the L-rd seven days; on the first day, a resting, and on the seventh day, a resting.

But on the fifteenth day - It was taught: I might think that the *chagigah* offering] was offered on Sabbath; it is, therefore, written: "But" — it is on the festival that you present the *chagigah*, but not on the Sabbath [if that is when the festival falls out] (Torath Cohanim).¹¹⁷

a resting - It was taught: Consecrated food [such as nothar, which must be burned] is not burned on a festival. Why so? R. Ashi said: "a resting" is a positive commandment, so that a festival contains a positive [i.e., the afore-mentioned] and a negative commandment [i.e., "Do not perform any labor"]; and a positive commandment [in this case, that of burning consecrated food] does not ovberride a positive and a negative commandment (Shabbath 24b). 118,119

23:40 And you shall take for yourselves on the first day the fruit of a tree that is *hadar*, branches of date-palms, a branch of a plaited tree, and willows of the brook; and you shall rejoice before the L-rd your G-d seven days.

And you shall take - The Rabbis taught: "Ulekachtem" ["And you shall take"] — the taking should be whole [acronymically, "Ulekach" — and take; "tam" — whole]. From here it is derived that the four species are mutually indispensable (Succah 34b). 120

And you shall take - There must be a taking for each one individually [i.e., one cannot take on behalf of another] (*Ibid.* 41b).¹²¹

And you shall take for yourselves - of what belongs to you, to exclude [fulfilling the mitzvah with] what is borrowed or stolen (Ibid.). 122

And you shall take for yourselves - "for yourselves" — of what is yours, to exclude that from which you are forbidden to derive benefit [e.g., an ethrog of arlah] (Yerushalmi Succah 3:1).¹²³

on the first day - in the daytime, and not at night (Succah 43a). 124

on the first day - The entire day is valid for the taking of the *lulav*, it being written: "And you shall take for yourselves on the first day" (Megillah 20b).¹²⁵

the first - And it is written: "and you shall rejoice before the L-rd your G-d seven days." Just as "seven" are [clearly] the seven days of the festival, so "the first" is the first day of the festival [and not the day preceding the festival] (*Pesachim* 5a). 126

the fruit of a tree that is hadar - One who sees an ethrog in a dream is hadar ["beautiful"] in the eyes of his Creator, it being written [concerning the ethrog]: "the fruit of a tree that is hadar" (Berachoth 57a).¹²⁷

the fruit of a tree that is hadar - It was taught: R. Yishmael says: "the fruit of a tree that is hadar" — one [i.e., one ethrog]; "branches of date palms" — one; "a branch of a plaited tree" — three [for otherwise it is not "plaited"]; "willows of the brook" — two (Succah 34b). 128, 129

the fruit of a tree that is hadar - One ethrog is taken, and not two. Why so? For it is written: "the fruit of a tree that is hadar." Scripture speaks of one fruit, and not of two or three (Ibid. 35a). 130

the fruit of a tree that is hadar - The Rabbis taught: "the fruit of a tree that is hadar" — a tree, the taste of whose trunk and whose fruit is the same, i.e., an ethrog. Rebbi says: Read it not "hadar," but "hadir" ["the corral"] — Just as in a corral, before the small ones arrive the grown ones are already there; so, with the ethrog. R. Avahu says: Read it not "hadar," but "hador" [that lives] — something that lives on its tree [i.e., that is produced] from year to year. Ben Azzai says: Read it not "hadar," but "idor," for in Greek, "water" is called "idor" ["hydro"]. And what is it that thrives on all kinds of water? An ethrog (Ibid.).¹³¹

hadar - to exclude one [an ethrog] that is dry [i.e., shriveled] (Succah 29b). 132

branches of date-palms [kapoth temarim] - Ravina asked R. Ashi: How do we know that "kapoth temarim" is a lulav? Perhaps it is a charutha [a hardened palm shoot]? "Kafuth" [like "kapoth," i.e., The component sprouts] must be able to be "pressed together," and this property is lacking [in a charutha]. Perhaps uftha [the central stalk] is intended? "Kafuth" ["pressed together"] implies susceptibility of separation, but this [uftha] is "eternally" kafuth. But perhaps kufra [a spike-palm] is intended? Abbaye answered [This cannot be so, for it is written (Proverbs 3:17): "Her [the Torah's] ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace" [i.e., and not "spikes"] (Ibid. 32a). 133-137

branches of date-palms - Rabbah Tosfa'ah said to Ravina: Perhaps two *lulavim* are intended [it being written "kapoth" (plural)]? He answered: It is written [in such a way as to allow a reading of] "kapath" [singular]. [But in that case] perhaps a single shoot [of the branch system is intended]! He answered: [In that case] it would be written "kaf" (Ibid.). 138, 139

branches of date-palms - It was taught: I might think that the *ethrog* should be tied together with the other species. [But this is not so, for] is it written: "the tree of a fruit that is *hadar* and branches of date-palms" [which would imply that they should be bound together]? All that is written is: "branches of date-palms" [without the linkage] (*Ibid.* 34b). 140

and a branch of a plaited tree - The Rabbis taught: "the branch of a plaited tree" — [the connotation is] one whose leaves cover its wood; this is the hadas [the myrtle] (Ibid. 32b). 141

and a branch of a plaited tree - It was taught: "a plaited tree" is valid; one that is not plaited is invalid. What is "plaited"? R. Yehudah said: Three leaves to a node [along the length of the stem] (*Ibid.*). 142

and willows of the brook - The Rabbis taught: What is the aravah [willow]? Its stem is red, its leaf extended [and not rounded], and its edge smooth [and not jagged] (*Ibid.* 34a).¹⁴³

and willows of the brook - It was taught: Abba Shaul says: "willows," two; one for the *lulav* and one for [i.e., in commemoration of] the Sanctuary [where the altar was circled with willow] (*Ibid.*). 144

and willows of the brook. This tells me only of willows of the brook. Whence do I derive that those of the field and of the hills [are also valid]? From: "willows of the brook" — in any event [i.e., any willows resembling willows of the brook] (*Ibid.* 33b).¹⁴⁵

and willows of the brook - The Rabbis taught: "willows of the brook" — [of the type] that grow by the brook; to exclude "tzaftzafah" [a type of willow] which grows in the mountains (Ibid. 34a). 146

and willows of the brook - Abbaye said: "Chilfa gila" [a type of willow with rounded leaves and slightly serrated edges] is valid for use as a hoshana [i.e., aravah]. And though it is designated by a unique epithet it is, nonetheless, valid. Why so? For it is written: "willows of the brook"— in any event [see above (145)] (Ibid.). 147,148

and you shall rejoice, etc. - Though it is a mitzvah to rejoice on all the festivals, on Succoth there was an extra measure of rejoicing in the Temple, it being written: "and you shall rejoice before the L-rd your G-d seven days" (Rambam, Hilchoth Lulav 18:2). 149

and you shall rejoice - There are those who relate "and you shall rejoice" to rejoicing with the peace-offerings, and there are others who relate it to rejoicing with the *lulav* (Yerusahlmi Succah 3:11). 149*

seven days - "before the L-rd your G-d seven days" — and not in the borders [i.e., outside of Jerusalem] all seven days [but only on the first]. And after the destruction of the Temple, R. Yochanan b. Zakkai instituted that the *lulav* be taken in the country [i.e., outside of Jerusalem] all seven days in commemoration of the Temple (*Torath Cohanim*). 150,151

23:41 And you shall celebrate it as a festival to the L-rd, seven days a year, a statute forever throughout your generations; on the seventh month shall you celebrate it.

And you shall celebrate it as a festival - R. Pappa asked Abbaye: How

do we know that "And you shall celebrate it as a festival to the L-rd" refers to the sacrificial offering? Perhaps it refers to dancing [both "festival" and "dancing" in Hebrew, having the same root, "chaga"]? He answered: Do not entertain that assumption, for it is written (Exodus 23:18): "And the fat of My offering ["chagi"] shall not remain until morning" (Chagigah 10b). 152,153

a festival to the L-rd - Beth Hillel says: [Animals for] peace-offerings and burnt-offerings are presented on festivals and the "placing of the hands" is performed upon them [though this is not a very "festival-like" type of activity]. Whence is this derived? From: "And you shall celebrate it as a festival [technically: "offer the festival offering"] to the L-rd"—All that is "to the L-rd" [including the placing of the hands] is permitted (Beitzah 19a). 154

seven days - It was taught: I might think that one must bring a festive offering all seven days; it is, therefore, written: "And you shall celebrate it" — You celebrate [i.e., present the offering on] it [i.e., the first day], and you do not celebrate all seven. If so, why is "seven" mentioned? For restitution [i.e., If it were not brought the first day, it may be brought in the seven days that follow] (Chagigah 9a). 155,156

seven days - But are they seven days? Are they not eight? From here it is derived that the chagigah [the festive offering] does not override the Sabbath (Pesachim 70b). 157,158

on the seventh month - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one did not offer the festive offering on the first day of the festival he may do so on all of the remaining days and on the last festival day? From: "on the seventh month [and not only one day] shall you celebrate [i.e., offer] it" If: "on the seventh month," I might think that one could offer it the entire month; it is, therefore, written: "shall you celebrate it" — "it" [i.e., the festival days] you celebrate [i.e., offer], but you do not celebrate outside of it [i.e., on the days after the festival] (Chagigah 9a). 159-161

23:42 In succoth shall you sit seven days; every citizen in Israel shall sit in succoth.

In succoth shall you sit - A succah which is higher than twenty ells is

unfit [for the *mitzvah* of succah]. Whence is this derived? Rava said: From: "In succoth shall you sit seven days." The Torah is hereby saying: All seven days remove yourself from a permanent dwelling and sit in a temporary one. Up to twenty ells a dwelling can be built in such a way that it is temporary. Above twenty ells a dwelling cannot be built as a temporary habitation, but must be built as a permanent one (Succah 2a). 162

In succoth shall you sit - A succah which does not have three walls is unfit; but if it had two regular walls and a third, even the size of a tefach, it is fit. Whence is this derived? From: "In succoth," "in succoth," in succoth," in succoth," in succoth," in this section allude to four walls [the third "basukkoth" being written plene in the Hebrew, thus alluding to two walls]. Subtract one [citation] for itself [i.e., to state the halachah of succah] — this leaves us with three: two referring to regular walls and the third coming under the masoretic rule which permits its being "reduced" to the size of a tefach (Succah 6b). 163,164

In succoth shall you sit - The Rabbis taught: "In succoth shall you sit" [This is mentioned three times, each for a particular exclusion] — and not in a succah underneath a succah; and not in a succah underneath a tree; and not in a succah underneath a house (*Ibid.* 9b).¹⁶⁵

In succoth shall you sit - It was taught: "In succoth shall you sit" — a succah of any kind [and not just of the four species mentioned above (e.g., lulav, etc.)]. And thus it is stated in respect to Ezra (*Nechemiah* 8:15): "Go out to the mountain and bring olive branches, and branches of wild olive, and myrtle branches, and palm branches, and branches of thick trees to make succoth, as it is written" (*Ibid.* 36a). 166

In succoth shall you sit - "shall you sit," similar to "shall you dwell." Just as in one's dwelling, if he wishes, he eats; and if he wishes, he does not eat, so, in a succah, if one wishes he eats; and if he wishes, he does not eat [on all the days of the festival excluding the first] (*Ibid.* 27a). 167

In succoth shall you sit - The Rabbis taught: "shall you sit," similar to "shall you dwell." From here it is derived that all seven days of the festival one makes his succah permanent, and his house, temporary. How so? If he has beautiful vessels, he takes them to the succah;

beautiful spreads, he takes them to the succah. He eats, drinks, walks, and learns in the succah (*Ibid.* 28b). 168

In succoth shall you sit - "shall you sit" similar to "shall you dwell." Just as "a dwelling" intimates a man and his wife, so, "a succah" — a man and his wife (*Ibid.*).¹⁶⁹

shall you sit seven days - It is written here: "shall you sit seven days," and, in respect to the priestly consecration (8:35): "shall you sit day and night, seven days." Just as there, days and even nights; here, too, days and even nights (*Ibid.* 43b).¹⁷⁰

every citizen in Israel - It was taught: Even though it was stated that one does not fulfill his obligation with his neighbor's *lulav*, he *does* fulfill his obligation with his neighbor's succah, it being written: "every citizen in Israel shall sit in succoth," indicating it to be fitting that all Jews sit in one succah (*Ibid.* 27b).¹⁷¹

every citizen in Israel - The Rabbis taught: "citizen" — this is the citizen himself; [lit.,] "the citizen" — to exclude women [from the obligation of succah]; "every" — to include minors; "in Israel" — to include converts (*Ibid.* 28b).¹⁷²

23:43 So that your generations know that I caused the children of Israel to dwell in succoth when I took them out of the land of Egypt; I am the L-rd your G-d.

So that your generations know - A succah which is higher than twenty ells is not fit [for the fulfillment of the *mitzvah*]. Whence is this derived? Rabbah said: From: "So that your generations know that I caused the children of Israel to dwell in succoth." Up to twenty ells, one realizes [by noticing the *schach* covering] that he is dwelling in a succah; above twenty ells, one does not realize that he is dwelling in a succah, his eye, not taking in the *schach* (*Ibid.* 2a).¹⁷³

that I caused the children of Israel to dwell in succoth - Which succoth? R. Eliezer says: The clouds of glory; R. Akiva says: "succoth," literally (*Ibid.* 11b).¹⁷⁴

when I took them out - This teaches us that even the succah is a reminder of the exodus from Egypt (Torath Cohanim).¹⁷⁵

23:44 And Moses declared the festivals of the L-rd to the children of Israel.

And Moses declared - What is the intent of this? Because we learned only that the daily burnt-offering and the Paschal lamb override Sabbath, it being written concerning them: "in its appointed season," whence would we derive that the other communal offerings also override the Sabbath? It is, therefore, written (Numbers 29:39): "These you shall offer to the L-rd in your appointed seasons." Whence would we derive [the same rule for] the omer and what is offered along with it; the two loaves and what is offered along with them? It is, therefore, written: "And Moses declared the festivals of the L-rd to the children of Israel" — Scripture established a set time ["festivals" ("moadim") = appointed times] for all of the offerings [even if the Sabbath must be overriden] (Pesachim 77a). 176-178

And Moses declared - When the New Moon is declared, the head of beth-din says: "It is sanctified." Whence is this derived? Rebbi said: From: "And Moses declared the festivals of the L-rd" (Rosh Hashanah 24a).¹⁷⁹

And Moses declared - This teaches us that it is a mitzvah to call out each festival in its appointed time (Megillah 32a). 180

the festivals of the L-rd - It was taught: "the festivals of the L-rd" is written, but "the Sabbath of creation" is not written. [This teaches us that] the festivals of the L-rd require declaration by beth-din [they being the ultimate decisors of the times of the festivals], but the Sabbath of creation does not require declaration by beth-din [it being fixed in the order of time] (Nedarim 78a). [181]

- 24:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 24:2 Command the children of Israel that they bring to you

pure olive oil, crushed for the light, to cause a light to burn continuously.

Command, etc. - see Exodus, beginning of Tetzaveh

24:3 Outside the veil of the testimony, in the tent of meeting, shall Aaron order it, from evening until morning, before the L-rd continuously, an everlasting statute throughout your generations.

Outside the veil of the testimony - Now was the light of the menorah required? Was it not with His light [i.e., that of the Shechinah] by which the Jews traveled all forty years in the desert! Rather [it is to be understood as meaning that] it served as testimony to the inhabitants of the world that the Shechinah resided in Israel. What is the testimony? Rava said: It is the western lamp, into which he would place as much oil as in all the other lamps, and yet would commence [lighting all the other lamps] with it and conclude [servicing the lamps] with it (Shabbath 22b).

shall Aaron order it - This teaches us that Aaron and his sons arrange only one lamp [in the menorah] (Torath Cohanim).²

24:4 Upon the pure menorah shall he arrange the lamps before the L-rd always.

Upon the pure menorah - R. Shmuel b. Nachmani said in the name of R. Yonathan: "Upon the *pure* menorah" — its instructions [i.e., the instructions for its building] came from a place of purity [the figure of a flaming menorah appearing to Moses from Heaven] (*Menachoth* 29a).³

Upon the pure menorah - upon the body of the menorah; the lamps were not to be propped up with chips of wood or stones (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴

before the L-rd - It was not to be arranged outside and then brought within (*Ibid.*).⁵

always - even on the Sabbath; even in a state of uncleanliness (Ibid.).6

24:5 And you shall take fine flour and you shall bake it [into] twelve *chaloth*; two-tenths [of an *ephah*] shall the one *chalah* be.

And you shall take fine flour, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "fine flour and you shall bake" — this teaches us that fine flour is taken. Whence is it derived that even wheat [may be brought, from which flour is later taken]? From: "And you shall take" — any kind of taking. I might think that the same applies to all meal-offerings [and not only to the show-bread]; it is, therefore, written: "and you shall bake it" (Menachoth 76b).^{7,8}

twelve chaloth, etc. - "twelve chaloth" — they must be alike; "two-tenths [of fine flour]" — they must be alike (Torath Cohanim).9

two-tenths, etc. - "two-tenths of an *ephah* shall the one *chalah* be"—this teaches us that they are kneaded one by one. Whence do we derive that the same applies to the two loaves? From: "shall be" [connoting extension of application] (*Menachoth* 94a).¹⁰

24:6 And you shall place them in two rows, six in a row, upon the pure table before the L-rd.

And you shall place them - It was taught: Whence is it derived that they were baked two by two? From "And you shall place them." I might think that the same applies to the two loaves; it is, therefore, written: "them" (Ibid.). 11,12

And you shall place them, etc. - How does he arrange them? In two rows of six *chaloth* each; and if he makes one row of four and the other of eight, it is invalid (*Ibid.* 98a).¹³

upon the pure table - Resh Lakish said: "upon the pure table" — They would lift it [the table] before those who came up for the festival, and they would say: "See how beloved you are before the Holy One Blessed be He!" And the removal of the show-bread was like its arrangement [i.e., just as it was arranged while hot, so it was removed while hot (miraculously)], as it is written (I Samuel 21:7): "to replace it with bread, which was hot on the day of its removal" (Chagigah 26b).14

upon the pure table - upon the table itself; the appendages did not raise the bread above the table (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁵

And you shall place upon the row pure frankincense; and it shall be a memorial for the bread, a fire-offering to the L-rd.

And you shall place upon the row - It was taught: Rebbi says: "And you shall place upon [al] the row" — "al" here means "nearby." But perhaps it means "upon," literally! [This cannot be, for] it is written (Exodus 40:3): "And you shall hang the veil al the ark" [where the meaning cannot be "upon"], but must be "nearby" (Menachoth 98a). 16

And you shall place upon the row — It was taught: I might think that one row is intended [But this is not so, for] it is written here: "row," and, above: "two rows." Just as there, two rows are indicated; here, too, two rows are intended (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁷

and it shall be a memorial for the bread - It is indispensable to the bread. This teaches us that [piggul thoughts (thoughts effecting rejection of the offering) in respect to] the frankincense — hold back, render piggul, and invalidate the bread (Ibid.).¹⁸

24:8 On the day of Sabbath, on the day of Sabbath, he shall place it before the L-rd always; from the children of Israel, an everlasting covenant.

On the day of Sabbath, etc. - This teaches us that on the day of Sabbath he arranges the new [incense vessel] and on the day of Sabbath he smokes the previous one (*Ibid.*).¹⁹

he shall place it - This teaches us that he does not arrange the staves with the bread on Sabbath; but he comes in on Sabbath eve, removes the staves, places them across the length of the table [and arranges them between the breads at the conclusion of the Sabbath] (*Ibid.*).²⁰

always - see commentary on Numbers 2:17 and 4:7

24:9 And it shall be for Aaron and for his sons. And they shall eat it in a holy place, for holy of holies it is to him, of the fire-offerings of the L-rd, an everlasting statute.

And it shall be for Aaron and for his sons - Half for Aaron and half for his sons (Yoma 17b).²¹

holy of holies it is - "it" — This teaches us that if one of them crumbles, all are invalidated (*Torath Cohanim*).²²

holy of holies it is to him - To Aaron, without "dispute" [i.e., He can take whichever part he likes], and to his sons, with "dispute" (*Ibid.*).²³

an everlasting statute - The two arrangements [of the show-bread] are indispensable, one for the other; the two frankincense vessels are indispensable, one for the other; the arrangements and the frankincense vessels are mutually indispensable. Whence is this derived? From: "a statute" [which carries this connotation of indispensability] (Menachoth 27a).²⁴

- 24:10 And the son of an Israelite woman went out; and he was the son of an Egyptian man in the midst of the children of Israel. And they strove within the camp, the son of the Israelite woman and the Israelite man.
- 24:11 And the son of the Israelite woman blasphemed the Name, and he cursed. And they brought him to Moses. And the name of his mother was Shlomith the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan.

And he cursed - It is not written: "And he 'blessed," But: "And he cursed." This teaches us that there is no death penalty for cursing with an epithet [(in which case "blessed" is used), but only with the Name] (Torath Cohanim).²⁵

24:12 And they put him in confinement, to be explained to them [what his judgment was] at the mouth of the L-rd.

to be explained to them - This teaches us that Moses did not know at all whether or not he was subject to the death penalty (Sanhedrin 78b).²⁶

- 24:13 And the L-rd spoke to Moses, saying:
- 24:14 Take the curser outside of the camp, and let all who heard place their hands on his head; and let all the congregation stone him.

outside of the camp - outside of the three camps (Ibid. 42b).27

and let all who heard place - "and let... who heard place" — these are the witnesses; "all who heard" — these are the judges; "their hands" — the hands of each, individually; "their hands on his head" — they place their hands upon him and say to him: "Your blood is on your head, for you brought yourself to this" (Torath Cohanim). 28-30

and let them stone him - A man is stoned naked, but a woman is not stoned naked. Whence is this derived? From: "and let them stone him" — "him" without his clothing, but her, with her clothing (Sanhedrin 45a).³¹

all the congregation - Now does all the congregation stone him! Rather [the meaning is that] the witnesses stone him in the presence of the entire congregation (*Torath Cohanim*).³²

24:15 And to the children of Israel, you shall speak, saying: A man, a man, if he curse his G-d, then he shall bear his sin.

A man, a man - What is the intent of: "A man, a man"? To include gentiles in the exhortation against cursing the L-rd, as Jews are (Sanhedrin 56a).¹³

then he shall bear his sin - What is the intent of this? Is it not explicitly stated (16): "And he who blasphemes the Name shall die"? [The resolution is that cursing] the Name itself is punishable by death; [whereas cursing through] an epithet is a transgression of an exhortation (*Ibid.*).³⁴

24:16 And he who blasphemes the Name of the L-rd shall die.

All the congregation shall stone him. Proselyte, as bornJew — if he blasphemes the Name, he shall die.

And he who blasphemes [nokev] the Name of the L-rd - How do we know that "nokev" has to do with cursing? Because it is written: "vayikov...and he cursed." [In that case,] perhaps he must do both [to be liable]. Do not entertain this notion, for it is written: "Take the curser outside," indicating clearly that they are one and the same (Ibid.). 35,36

All the congregation shall stone him - All the congregation must be as foes to him (*Torath Conanim*).³⁷

Proselyte, as born-Jew - R. Miasha said: A Noachide who "blesses" the Name by epithet is liable [i.e., he receives the death penalty]. Why so? For it is written: "Proselyte, as born-Jew — if he blasphemes the Name, he shall die." It is a proselyte or born-Jew who must blaspheme the Name itself [to receive the death penalty], but a gentile is liable even if he employs one of the epithets (Sanhedrin 56a).³⁸

["As] proselyte, as born-Jew - "Proselyte" — this is the proselyte himself; "As proselyte" — to include the wives of proselytes; "born-Jew" — this is the male; "as born-Jew" — to include the wives of born-Jews (Torath Cohanim).³⁹

if he blasphemes the Name - It was taught: He is not liable until he "blesses" the Name by the Name [i.e., "May X curse X"]. Whence is this derived? Shmuel said: From [the repetition of]: "And he who blasphemes the *Name*...if he blasphemes the *Name*, he shall die" (Sanhedrin 56a).^{40,41}

if he blasphemes the Name - If one curses his father and mother by epithet, R. Meir says that he is liable [i.e., that he receives the death penalty], and the sages say that he is not liable. What is the sages' source? R. Menachem b. R. Yossi says: They derive it from: "if he blasphemes the Name, he shall die." Why mention this [if it is already written: "And he who blasphemes the Name, etc."]? It teaches us that if one curses his father and mother [who are likened to the Creator], he is not liable until he curses them by name (*Ibid.* 66a).⁴²

24:17 And a man if he smite all the soul of a man shall be put to death.

And a man if he smite - I might think that [he is liable] even if he struck him [after others had done so, and he died after this last blow]; it is, therefore, written (*Exodus* 21:12): "If one smites a man and he *dies*, he shall be put to death" — he is not liable unless he [by himself] caused his soul to expire (*Mechilta, Mishpatim* 21:12).⁴³

And a man if he smite - I might think that even a minor is liable; it is, therefore, written: "And a man if he smite" (*Ibid.*).⁴⁴

all the soul - The Rabbis taught: If ten men smote him with ten rods and he died, whether they did so all at once or one after the other, they are not liable. Whence is this derived? From: "And a man if he smite all the soul of a man" — [He is not liable] unless he has smitten all of the soul (Sanhedrin 78a).⁴⁵

all the soul - I might think [that he is liable] even for a nefel [a child that is certain to die] or an eight-month-birth [which cannot survive]; it is, therefore, written (Exodus 21:12): "If one smites a man and he dies, he shall be put to death" (Ibid. 84b).46

all the soul - One who kills a one-day-old infant incurs the death penalty, it being written: "And a man if he smite all the soul of a man" — any soul (Niddah 44b).⁴⁷

24:18 And one that smites a beast shall pay for it — a life for a life.

shall pay for it - The Rabbis taught: "The damages must be totaled"—this teaches us that the owner [of the ox] deals with the carcass [i.e., the total payment for damages is arrived at by deducting the value of the carcass from the value of the living ox]. Whence is this derived? R. Ami said: From: "And one that smites a beast shall pay for it ("yeshalmenah"]; read it not "yeshalmenah," but "yashlimenah" [i.e., "make up the total"] (Bava Kamma 10b). 48,49

24:19 And a man, if he inflicts an injury upon his neighbor; as he did, so shall it be done to him.

And a man, etc. - Now let an ox who injures [a man] be liable [i.e., let its owner be liable] for four things ["pain, healing, disability, and shame"] a fortiori, viz.: If a man, who is liable for four things is not liable for kofer [an indemnity payment for killing a man], an ox, which is liable for kofer, should it not be liable for four things! [This argument is not entertained, for] it is written: "And a man, if he inflicts an injury upon his neighbor"— a man upon his neighbor, and not an ox upon his [i.e., its owner's] neighbor (Ibid. 26a). 50,51

if he inflicts an injury - This tells me only of an [actual] injury. Whence do I derive [that the same halachah applies] if he screamed in one's ear, tore one's hair, spit at someone and hit him with his spittle, pulled off someone's garment, or uncovered a woman's head in the market-place? From: "as he did" [i.e., though no actual injury was inflicted]. And whence is it derived [that the same halachah applies] if he placed one in the sun so that he was overcome by heat, or in the cold so that he was chilled, or "sicked" a dog or a snake to bite him? From: "as he did" (Torath Cohanim). 52

24:20 A breaking for a breaking, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; as one gives an injury to his fellow, so shall it be given to him.

so shall it be given to him - This "giving" is money [i.e., monetary compensation for the injury]. Whence is this derived? Let us see. It is written (19): "And a man, if he inflicts an injury upon his neighbor; as he did, so shall it be done to him." Why, then, is it necessary to write: "so shall it be given to him"? The implication is that money is to be given (Bava Kamma 84a).⁵³

24:21 And one who strikes a beast shall pay, and one who strikes a man shall be put to death.

and one who strikes a man - It is written: "one who strikes a man," and: "one who strikes a beast." The one is being likened to the other.

Just as one who strikes a beast makes monetary [and not bodily] compensation, so, one who strikes a man makes monetary compensation (*Ibid.* 83b).⁵⁴

and one who strikes a man - It was taught in the school of Chezkiah: "one who strikes a man" — "and one who strikes a beast." Striking a man is being likened to striking a beast. Just as if one strikes a beast, whether wittingly or unwittingly, whether intentionally or unintentionally, whether going down or going up — no distinction is made to exempt him from payment, but he is liable for payment; in the same way, if one strikes a man [and kills him, no distinction (of the above type) is made to make him liable for monetary payment, but he is exempt from such payment] (Sanhedrin 79b).55

and one who strikes a man - "one who strikes a man" — "and one who strikes a beast." One who strikes a man is being likened to one who strikes a beast. Just as one who strikes a beast is not liable unless he causes a wound, the word "soul" being written in that context (18); so, one who strikes a man is not liable unless he causes a wound (*Ibid.* 84b). 56,57

and one who strikes a man - "one who strikes a man" — "and one who strikes a beast." One who strikes a man is being likened to one who strikes a beast. Just as one who wounds a beast for therapeutic purposes is not liable; so, one who wounds a man for such purposes (*Ibid.*).58

and one who strikes a man - "one who strikes a man" — "and one who strikes a beast." One who strikes a man is being likened to one who strikes a beast. Just as one who strikes a beast — in its lifetime; so, one who strikes a man — in his lifetime (Torath Cohanim).⁵⁹

and one who strikes a man shall be put to death - What is the intent of this? Because it is written (*Exodus* 21:15): "And one who strikes his father and his mother shall be put to death," I might think that he is not liable until he strikes both; it is, therefore, written: "and one who strikes a man" — even one of them (*Ibid.*).60

24:22 One judgment shall there be for you; for proselyte as for born-Jew shall it be, for I am the L-rd your G-d.

One judgment shall there be for you - a judgment that is the same for all of you (Kethuvoth 33a).61

One judgment shall there be for you - R. Chanina said: According to the Torah, both capital cases and monetary litigations require thorough cross-examination of the witnesses. Why, then, did the sages say that monetary litigations do not require such cross-examination? So that the door not be closed to borrowers [people fearing to lend, lest their witnesses be "caught" in some technicality of cross-examination] (Sanhedrin 3a).^{62,63}

24:23 And Moses spoke to the children of Israel, and they took the curser outside the camp, and they stoned him with a stone; and the children of Israel did as the L-rd commanded Moses.

And they took the curser outside - From here we derive that the stoning site was outside of beth-din (Ibid. 42b).⁶⁴

And they stoned him with a stone - "him," without his garment [see commentary (31)]; "a stone" — if he dies by one stone, it is sufficient (*Ibid.* 43a).65,66

and the children of Israel did - What is the intent of this? They did all [in accordance with the halachoth of stoning] such as placing [their hands on his head] and thrusting him [in the prescribed manner] (Ibid.).⁶⁷

Behar

25:1 And the L-rd spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, saying:

on Mount Sinai - Why is *shemitah* [the section on the Sabbatical year] juxtaposed with Mount Sinai? Werenotall the *mitzvoth* given at Sinai? [The purpose of the juxtaposition is to indicate that] just as the general rules and specific ordinances of *shemitah* were enunciated at Sinai, so, with all the *mitzvoth* (*Torath Cohanim*).¹

25:2 Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: When you come to the land that I give to you, the land shall rest a Sabbath to the L-rd.

When you come to the land - It was taught: I might think [that this phrase subsumes] coming to Trans-Jordan; it is, therefore, written: "to the land" — the specific land [i.e., Eretz Yisrael]. I might think [that it subsumes] coming to Ammon and Moav; it is, therefore, written: "that I give to you," and not Ammon and Moav (Ibid.).²

the land shall rest - It was taught: R. Yochanan said in the name of R. Yanai: A tree planted in one's house is subject to arlah and exempt from ma'aser [arlah applying to the "land," and ma'aser to the "field"]. And whether it is subject to shevi'ith [the laws of shemitah] is open to question, for it is written [in respect to shemitah]: "the land shall rest" and [yet,] (4): "your field you shall not sow" (Yerushalmi Arlah 1:2).^{3,4}

a Sabbath to the L-rd - It was taught: A vineyard sowed for consecrated purposes is subject to *shevi'ith*? Why so? It is written: "the land shall rest a Sabbath to the L-rd" — What is "to the L-rd" is subject to *shevi'ith* (Yerushalmi Peah 7:7).5

25:3 Six years shall you sow your field and six years shall you prune your vineyard, and you shall collect its produce.

Six years shall you sow - It was taught: R. Yochanan said: One who plows on the seventh year does not receive stripes. Why so? For it is written: "Six years shall you sow" — and not on shevi'ith; "and six years shall you prune" — and not on shevi'ith. And every negative commandment [in this case, not to plow,] derived from a positive one [in this case, by inference from a positive one (i.e., it is only sowing and pruning which are interdicted by both positive and negative commandment, whereas plowing is interdicted by positive alone, viz.: "the land shall rest")] — every negative commandment derived from a positive one is regarded as a positive one [and, as such, does not carry along with it the penalty of stripes] (Yerushalmi Kilaim 8:1).6

and you shall collect its produce - It was taught: R. Yonathan b. R. Yossi says: Whence is it derived that produce which was one-third grown before the Rosh Hashanah of the Sabbatical year may be gathered on shevi'ith? From: "and you shall collect its produce. (And [you shall collect (in the above instance)] on) the seventh year" (Yerushalmi Ma'asroth 5:2).

25:4 And on the seventh year a Sabbath of resting shall there be for the land, a Sabbath to the L-rd; your field you shall not sow, and your vineyard you shall not prune.

And on the seventh year - It was taught: The first of Tishrei is the New Year for shemitah, for it is written: "And on the seventh year a Sabbath of resting shall there be for the land"; and the law is derived: "year" [here] - "from the beginning of the year" (Deuteronomy 11:12). Just as there, the first of Tishrei [is intended], so, here, the first of Tishrei (Rosh Hashanah 8b).8,9

And on the seventh year - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the thirty day period before Rosh Hashanah is regarded as the entire year? From: "And on the seventh year" [the month of Rosh Hashanah being regarded as a year in itself]. From here it is derived that the shevi'ith year of benoth shuach [a type of fig] is the second year [after the

shevi'ith in which it matured] because it matures every three years (Torath Cohanim). 10,11

a Sabbath to the L-rd - It was taught: Just as the seventh day of creation is called "Sabbath to the L-rd," so, the seventh year is called "Sabbath to the L-rd" (*Ibid.*).¹²

and your vineyard you shall not prune - Let us analyze this. Pruning is in the class of sowing; and gleaning (5), in that of harvesting. Why, then, did Scripture single them out for special mention? To teach that for these ancillary acts one is liable [in that they closely resemble the "class" act], but for others, not (Moed Katan 3a). 13,14

25:5 The after-growth of your harvest you shall not reap, and the grapes of your guarded vine you shall not glean; a year of rest shall there be for the land.

you shall not reap...you shall not glean - What is the intent of: "you shall not reap... you shall not glean"? You shall not reap as the reapers do, and you shall not glean as the gleaners do, but you may do so through some variation (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 8:6).¹⁵

a year of rest. This teaches us that with the advent of shevi'ith, though the fruits of that year are forbidden, you are permitted to work on the tree itself [it being "a year of rest" for the produce of the land]. The fruits themselves, however, are forbidden until the fifteenth of Shevat, [that being the New Year for trees] (Torath Cohanim). 16

25:6 And the resting of the land shall be for you to eat: for you, and your man-servant, and your maid-servant, and your hired man, and your sojourners who dwell with you.

And the resting of the land shall be - From "the resting" [i.e., fruit from a field which "rested" from work on the seventh year] you may eat, but you may not eat from the "guarded" [i.e., the worked] (*Ibid.*).¹⁷

for you - whatever you need it for: eating, drinking, anointing, or dyeing (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 7:1).18

for you - for you, and not for others (Torath Cohanim).19

for you to eat - "for you," in the manner of eating, where the enjoyment and consuming of the fruit come at the same time, to exclude [from the interdict against dealing with the fruits of shevi'ith] wood from which benefit is derived after it is consumed [i.e., wood converted into coal, the benefit coming from the coal], and to exclude wine used for soaking and cleaning clothing, in which instance the enjoyment [i.e., wearing the clothing] comes after the consuming [of the wine] (Succah 40a).²⁰

to eat - to eat, and not to waste (Pesachim 52b).21

to eat - to eat, and not to soak or to clean [clothing in, if the agent is edible]; and not to use as an emollient, or a spray, or a cathartic [again, if it is edible] (Succah 40a, b).^{22,23}

to eat - It was taught: An animal [which was purchased with fruits] of shevi'ith cannot be used to redeem the confirmed first-born of an ass. Why not? For Scripture writes: "to eat," and not for trade (Bechoroth 12b).²⁴

to eat - R. Chisda said: An animal [which was purchased with fruits] of shevi'ith is exempt from the law of the first-born [under which law the devoted portions would be burned and not eaten], but subject to the gifts of the priesthood [which are eaten]. It is exempt from the law of the first-born because scripture writes: "to eat," and not "to burn," and it is subject to the gifts of the priesthood because they satisfy: "to eat" (Ibid.).²⁵

to eat - "to eat," and not to bring thereof meal-offerings and libations [which are not eaten, but consumed by fire] (Torath Cohanim).²⁶

and your man-servant and your maid-servant - What is the intent of this? Because it is written (Exodus 23:11): "but the seventh year you shall let it rest and lie fallow that the poor of your people may eat," I might think that only the poor may eat. Whence do I derive that the rich, too, may eat? From: "to you, and your man-servant, and your maid-servant" [the possessor of servants being "rich"] (Torath Cohanim). 27,28

and your sojourners who dwell with you - "and your sojourners" -

these are the gentiles; "who dwell with you" — to include boarders (*Ibid.*).^{29,30}

25:7 And to your beast and to the animal which is in your land shall be all its produce to eat.

And to your beast and to your animal - So long as the animal eats it in the field [i.e., so long as it is found in the field], you may feed it to your beast in the house; if it has ended for the beast in the field, "end it" [i.e., remove it] for your beast from the house [i.e., Remove it from the house] (*Pesachim* 52b).³¹

which is in your land - This teaches us that fruits of shevi'ith are not taken outside of Eretz Yisrael (Shevi'ith 6:5).³²

shall be all its produce - A garment which was dyed in peels of shevi'ith fruit [after the period of its permissibility (see above)] must be burned, it being written: "shall be" — it remains in its shevi'ith state [regardless of any transformation it has undergone] (Bava Kamma 101b).³³

shall be all its produce - "shall be" — also to serve as fuel for kindling and as an agent for dyeing (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 7:1).34

all its produce - It was taught: R. Chiyya says: Scripture speaks of two types of produce; one, that which has been taken into the house, which may be eaten only when fully ripe, this type being referred to in: "shall be all its produce to eat"], and the second [the type which is eaten in the field, even half-ripe,] which is referred to in (12): "from the field" you shall eat its produce" (Ibid.). 35

all its produce - This teaches us that it is eaten only when fully ripe [see above] (Torath Cohanim). 16

25:8 And you shall count for yourself seven Sabbaths of years, seven years, seven times; and they shall be for you, the seven Sabbaths of years, forty-nine years.

And you shall count for yourself - [By "you"] Scripture is referring to beth-din (Ibid.), 37

seven Sabbaths of years - The first of Tishrei is the Rosh Hashanah of the Jubilee year. Whence is this derived? From: "And you shall count for yourself seven Sabbaths of years." Just as shemitoth ["Sabbaths"] and "years" are counted from the first of Tishrei, so, the Jubilee years (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:2).^{38,39}

and they shall be for you - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the years of *shemitah* are counted [e.g., "This is the third year of *shemitah*"]? From: "and they shall be for you the seven *Sabbaths* of years." And whence is it derived that the Jubilee years are counted [e.g., "which is the twenty-fourth year of the Jubilee"]? From: "and they shall be for you forty-nine years" (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴⁰

25:9 And you shall cause to pass a shofar of *teruah* in the seventh month on the tenth day of the month. On the day of atonement shall you cause to pass a shofar through all of your land.

And you shall cause to pass a shofar - It was taught: If one inverted the shofar and blew it [from the broad end], he did not fulfill the obligation. Whence is this derived? According to R. Mathnah, from: "And you shall cause to pass a shofar" — in the manner of its passing [i.e., with the narrow end closest to the man] (Rosh Hashanah 27b). 41

And you shall cause to pass a shofar - It is written here: "And you shall cause to pass a shofar," and, elsewhere (*Exodus* 36:6): "And Moses commanded, and they passed a voice through the camp." Just as there, a voice, here, too, a voice [i.e., a shofar blast, and not just the passing of the shofar itself] (*Ibid.*).⁴²

And you shall cause to pass a shofar - Scripture writes: "a shofar," and not two or three shofroth (Ibid. 26a).⁴³

And you shall cause to pass a shofar, etc. - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that a shofar is required? From: "And you shall cause to pass a shofar." And whence is it derived that there is a plain blast [i.e., a single, uninterrupted blast (tekiah)] before it [i.e., before the teruah ("broken" blasts)]? From: "And you shall cause to pass [connoting a single "passing"] a shofar of teruah." And whence is it derived that

there is a plain blast after it? From: "shall you cause to pass a shofar." And whence is it derived that the process must be repeated three times? From: "And you shall cause to pass a shofar of teruah" [preceded and followed by a tekiah], (Ibid. 23:24): "a Sabbath, a remembrance of teruah," (Numbers 21:1): "a day of teruah shall it be for you" (Ibid. 33b).44

in the seventh month - What is the intent of this? To teach that all the blowings of the seventh month [i.e., those of the Yom Kippur of the Jubilee year and those of Rosh Hashanah] are alike. And whence is it derived that the specific halachoth applying to one apply to the other? From: "seventh"-"seventh" [mentioned in respect to each]. What are these specific halachoth? Three [tekiah-teruah-tekiah] that are nine [i.e., the process is repeated three times]; the length of the tekiah equals that of the teruah; the length of the teruah equals that of three shevarim] (Ibid. 34b). 45.46

On the day of atonement - "On the day" — and not at night; "On the day of atonement" — even if it falls out on the Sabbath (*Torath Cohanim*).⁴⁷

shall you [plural] cause to pass a shofar - This teaches us that each and every individual is obliged to blow (Rosh Hashanah 30a). 48

25:10 And you shall make holy the fiftieth year, and you shall call out freedom in the land to all of its inhabitants. It is a Jubilee year; it shall be for you. And you shall return a man to his possession, and a man to his family you shall return.

And you shall make holy, etc. - It was taught: "And you shall make holy the fiftieth year." What is the intent of this? Because it is written (9): "on the Day of Atonement," I might think, that it is sanctified only from Yom Kippur on; it is, therefore, written: "And you shall make holy the fiftieth year," which teaches us that its sanctity is initiated from its beginning [i.e., from Rosh Hashanah] (Ibid. 8b). 49-51

and you shall call out freedom - It was taught: The meaning of "dror" is "freedom." R. Yehudah said: What is "dror"? As one who is

authorized to carry his goods ["dayar"] throughout the entire district [because of the amnesty prevailing in the Jubilee year], so that he hawks his wares throughout the land (*Ibid.* 9b).⁵²

in the land - It applies even outside the land. The reason that "in the land" is written is to teach that when "dror" prevails in the land, it prevails also outside the land; and when it does not prevail in the land, it does not prevail outside the land (*Ibid.*).⁵³

to all of its inhabitants - When the tribes of Reuven and of Gad, and the half-tribe of Menashe were exiled, the Jubilee years ceased, as it is written: "And you shall call out freedom in the land to all of its inhabitants" — when all of its inhabitants are upon it. I might think that if they were upon it, but intermixed, the tribe of Benjamin with that of Judah, and that of Judah with Benjamin, that the Jubilee year would still obtain; it is, therefore, written: "to all of its inhabitants" — when they dwell as prescribed, and not when they are intermixed (Erchin 32b). 54,55

It is a Jubilee year - It was taught: The blowing of the shofar, the emancipation of servants, and the manumission of lands are all prerequisites for the Jubilee year [i.e., if one of the above does not obtain, the Jubilee year does not obtain]; for it is written [three times, one in respect to each of the above,]: "It is a Jubilee year," and the sages hold that a verse is expounded as applying to what precedes it and what follows it [the net result being that "It" refers to each of the above, so that if "it" exists, the Jubilee year exists, etc.] (Rosh Hashanah 9b).⁵⁶

and a man to his family - It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Yaakov said: Of what is Scripture speaking? If of one who sold himself [into servitude], the law in respect to this is already stated [40]; and if of one who was sold by the beth-din, the law in respect to this is likewise stated [41]. It must be speaking, then, of one who impressed himself into perpetual servitude by having his ear bored [as a sign of this submission] three or four years before the Jubilee year, Scripture telling us that the Jubilee releases him from this bondage. Where is this intimated? Rava b. Shila said: In: "a man." What is it that applies to a man and not to a woman? The ceremony of boring (Kiddushin 15a). 57,58

you shall return - to include a woman sold [by her father as a maid-servant] in the emancipation of the Jubilee year (*Torath Cohanim*).⁵⁹

25:11 It is a Jubilee year; the fiftieth year shall be for you. You shall not sow, and you shall not reap its after-growth, and you shall not glean the grapes of its guarded vine.

It is a Jubilee year; the fiftieth year - You count the fiftieth year [as the Jubilee year] and not the fifty-first year. [From here it is derived that the Jubilee year does not enter into the reckoning of the *shemitah* cycle (the forty-ninth year being *shemitah*, and the fifty-first year, the first year of the new *shemitah* cycle)] (Rosh Hashanah 9a).⁶⁰

You shall not sow - This teaches us that all that applies to shemitah [with respect to the tillage of the land] applies to the Jubilee year (Torath Cohanim).⁶¹

25:12 For it is a Jubilee year; holy shall it be to you. From the field shall you eat its produce.

it is a Jubilee year - even outside of the land [with respect to the emancipation of servants] (Rosh Hashanah 9b).⁶²

it is a Jubilee year - It was taught: I might think that just as the prohibition of shevi'ith attaches itself to its money [i.e., the money received from a sale of shevi'ith fruit], so, with all other prohibitions, the respective monies are attached; it is, therefore, written: "it is a Jubilee year" [in respect to such attachment], but not other prohibitions [unless expressly indicated] (Kiddushin 58a). 63

it is a Jubilee year - Just as it is holy, so its produce is holy (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 4:7).64

holy shall it be to you - It was taught: The prohibition of shevi'ith attaches itself to its money [see (63)]. Whence is this derived? From: "it is a Jubilee year; holy shall it be to you." Just as [the holiness of] sanctified objects attaches itself to their money [i.e., the money with which they were redeemed], so the prohibition of shevi'ith attaches itself to its money. But [in that case, let us say that] just as with sanctified

objects, the money is attached, but the objects themselves lose their sanctity, so with *shevi'ith* [i.e., let the fruit itself be permitted]! [This is counter-indicated by] "shall it *be*" — it remains in its original state [even if sold] (*Succah* 40b).⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷

holy shall it be to you - It was taught: R. Yochanan said: The prohibition of shevi'ith is transfered, both through selling [fruits of shevi'ith, in which case the monies are attached,] and through [a statement of] transference [i.e., "These fruits are 'transfered into' these monies"]; for it is written: "it is a Jubilee year; holy shall it be to you." Just as with sanctified objects [holiness is transfered] both through selling and through [a statement of] transference, so with shevi'ith (Ibid.). 68-70

holy shall it be to you - But it is not written: "holy shall it be to the *L-rd*." Therefore, if one betroths a woman with the fruits of shevi'ith, she is betrothed (Kiddushin 53a).⁷¹

From the field shall you eat - So long as you eat it [i.e., so long as it is found] in the field, you may eat it in the house. If it has "ended" from the field, end it [i.e., remove it] from the house (Yerushalmi Shevi'ith 9:3).⁷²

25:13 In the year of this Jubilee, you shall return a man to his possession.

In the year of this Jubilee, etc. - It was taught: R. Yossi b. Chanina said: Come and see how severe is the "dust" [i.e., even the peripheral transgression of the laws] of shevi'ith. If one does business with the fruit of shevi'ith, in the end he sells his movable objects, it being written: "In the year of this Jubilee, you shall return a man to his possession," followed by: [(the understood implication of your not doing so)] "And if you sell a selling to your fellow, or acquire from the hand of your fellow." [The reference is to] what is passed from hand to hand [i.e., movable objects]. If he does not feel this [i.e., if this does not affect him and he continues trafficking in shevi'ith], in the end he sells his fields, it being written (25): "If your brother grows poor and he sells of his holding." He will not leave off until he sells his house, it being written (29): "And a man, if he sells a house of dwelling." He will not leave off

until he sells his daughter, it being written (Exodus 21:7): "And if a man sells his daughter as a maid-servant." He will not leave off until he lends out money on interest, it being written (35): "And if your brother grows poor, and his hand falls with you," followed by (36): "Do not take from him interest or increase." He will not leave off until he sells himself, it being written (39): "And if your brother grows poor with you and he is sold to you"; not to you, but to a convert, it being written (47): "to a convert"; and not to a righteous convert, but to a sojourner, it being written (Ibid.): "to a sojourner." (Ibid.): "the family of a convert" — this is a gentile. (Ibid.): "or to the uprooted" — this is one that is sold to idolatry itself! (Kiddushin 20a). 13-76

In the year of this Jubilee - It was taught: Servants do not go free on shevi'ith. Whence is this derived? From: "In the year of this Jubilee, you shall return a man to his possession." "This" [i.e., the Jubilee year,] grants servants their freedom, but not shevi'ith (Torath Cohanim)."

you shall return — to include [a field given as] a gift as returning [to its original owner] on the Jubilee year (Bechoroth 52b).⁷⁸

you shall return - to include [a field] sold by a man and redeemed by his son as returning to the father on the Jubilee year (*Torath Cohanim*).⁷⁹

25:14 And if you sell a selling to your fellow, or acquire from the hand of your fellow, you shall not wrong, one man, his brother.

And if you sell a selling - It was taught: Hiring is subject to the law of "wronging." Why so? "Selling" is written, unqualified; and hiring, too, for its specific time period, is "selling" (Bava Metzia 56b). 80

And if you sell a selling - A "selling" whose substance is bought and sold is subject to the law of "wronging," to exclude [the sale of] notes of indebtedness (whose substance is not bought and sold, and which serve only as corroboration), as not coming under this law (*Ibid.*).81

a selling to your fellow - [It was taught: One Jew acquires from another by meshichah (drawing forth the object), but a gentile acquires from a Jew by money (without meshichah)], it being written:] "And if you sell

a selling to your fellow" — "to your fellow" by meshichah, but to a gentile, by money (Bechoroth 13a). 82

a selling to your fellow - To your fellow you return ona'ah [money gained by "wronging"], but you do not return it to an idolator (*Ibid.*).⁸³

a selling to your fellow - It was taught: Whence is it derived that when you sell, you shall sell only to your fellow [i.e., giving him first choice]? From: "And if you sell a selling to your fellow" (Torath Cohanim).84

or acquire from the hand of your fellow - It was taught: Whence is it derived that when you acquire, you shall acquire only from your fellow [i.e., giving him the first opportunity]? From: "And if you acquire from the hand of your fellow" (*Ibid.*).85

from the hand of your fellow - Property which is not intrinsically guaranteed [e.g., a movable object,] is acquired by *meshichah*. Whence is this derived? From: "or acquire from the hand of your fellow" — [the reference is to] what is transferred from hand to hand [i.e., movable objects] (Kiddushin 26a).86,87

from the hand of your father - Land and servants are not subject to the law of ona'ah, it being written: "... or acquire from the hand of your fellow, you shall not wrong" — [the reference is to] what is transfered from hand to hand; to exclude land, which is not movable, and to exclude servants, who are likened to land (Bava Metzia 56b). 88

from the hand of your fellow - "From the hand of your fellow" you acquire by meshichah but from the hand of a gentile, you acquire by money [without meshichah] (Bechoroth 13a).89

you shall not wrong - It was taught: How is "ona'ah" estimated? [For example, charging] four kesef more than twenty-four kesef (a sela) [which the object is actually worth], i.e., a sixth above the actual value (Bava Metzia 49b).⁹⁰

you shall not wrong - This tells me only of the buyer's being wronged. Whence do I derive the same halachah for the seller's being wronged? From: "or acquire from the hand of your fellow, you shall not wrong" (Ibid. 51a).91

one man, his brother - The law of ona'ah does not apply to sacred property, it being written: "you shall not wrong, one man, his brother" — "his brother," and not the sacred estates (*Ibid.* b). 92

one man, his brother - This tells me only of a man? Whence do we derive the same halachah for a woman vis à vis a man and a man vis à vis a woman? And this tells me only of a plain man [i.e., one who is not "business-wise"]. Whence do we derive the same halachah for a plain man vis à vis a merchant and a merchant vis à vis a plain man? From: "you shall not wrong, one man his brother" — in any case (Torath Cohanim).93

25:15 According to the number of years after the Jubilee year shall you buy from your fellow; according to the years of the crops shall he sell to you.

according to the years of the crops - We learned: Resh Lakish said: The acquisition of the *fruits* [of the land] is not equivalent to the acquisition of the land itself, as it is written: "according to the years of the crops shall he sell to you" [indicating that the *crops* are sold, and not the land] (Gittin 48b).94

according to the years of the crops - It was taught: If it were a year of blast or mildew or *shevi'ith*, or if the years were as those of Elijah [when no rain fell], they do not enter into the reckoning [of years of sale]. And this is so only if there were no crops at all, as in the years of Elijah; but if there were crops [in general, but not in *his* fields], they do enter into the reckoning, not being accounted a universal blight [but the buyer's misfortune] it being written: "according to the years of the crops," i.e., years where there are crops [somewhere] in the world (*Bava Metzia* 106a). 95-97

according to the years of the crops - R. Pappa said: If one sold stony fields, they may be redeemed even before two years; for it is written: "according to the years [the minimum number of "years" being two] of the crops," and these [stony fields] are not crop-yielding (Erchin 14b). 98,99

according to the years of the crops - R. Pappa said: If one sold trees,

they may not be redeemed before two years, it being written: "according to the years of the crops," and these are crop-yielding (*Ibid.*). 100

according to the years of the crops - The Rabbis taught: The "year" referred to in respect to a field of one's holding is a full [crop-producing] year, it being written: "according to the years of the crops shall he sell it to you." As a result, the buyer may sometimes eat three crops in two years [if he bought the field with a standing crop (see below)] (*Ibid.* 18b).¹⁰¹

according to the years of the crops - It was taught: R. Eliezer says: Whence is it derived that if one sold before Rosh Hashanah a field full of fruit, he may not say [upon his redeeming it]: "Hand it over to me as I handed it to you" [i.e., full of fruit]? [It is derived] from: "according to the years of the crops." The buyer may sometimes eat three crops in two years [indicating that the field, though received full, may be returned empty] (*Ibid.* 30a). 102

according to the years of the crops, etc. - One who sells his field when the Jubilee is in force may not redeem it before two years have passed, it being written: "according to the number of years of the crops shall he sell to you." And not only the seller [transgresses if he redeems it before two years], but the buyer, too, transgresses a positive commandment, it being written: "years [i.e., at least two]... shall you buy," and [if he sells it back before two years] this condition is not satisfied (*Ibid.* 29b). 103

25:16 According to the multitude of the years shall you increase its price, and according to the fewness of the years shall you diminish its price; for it is the number of crops that he sells to you.

According to the multitude of the years - It was taught (15): "According to the number of the years after the Jubilee year shall you buy." This teaches us that sales are made close to the Jubilee year [that has passed, in which case the field may be enjoyed for many years (until the next Jubilee year)]. Whence do we derive that sales may be made far from that year [i.e., close to the next Jubilee year]? From: "According to the multitude of the years...and according to the fewness of the years" (Erchin 29b). 104

25:17 And you shall not wrong, one man his fellow, and you shall fear your G-d; for I am the L-rd your G-d.

And you shall not wrong - The Rabbis taught: The verse (14) "And if you sell a selling to your fellow... you shall not wrong" already speaks of wronging in money matters. How, then, are we to understand [here]: "And you shall not wrong, one man his fellow"? As "wronging" with words (Bava Metzia 58b). 105

one man his fellow - R. Huna said: "And you shall not wrong, one man his fellow" ["amitho"] — One who is with you [im sheitecha (play on "amitho")] in Torah and mitzvoth, do not wrong him (Ibid. 59a).¹⁰⁶

and you shall fear your G-d - Whatever is relegated to the heart [i.e., what one knows to be wrong in his heart, though its wrongness does not appear on the surface] — of such things it is written: "And you shall fear your G-d" [who probes the heart] (Kiddushin 32b).¹⁰⁷

- 25:18 And you shall do My statutes, and My judgments you shall heed and you shall do them, and you shall dwell on the land securely.
- 25:19 And the land will give its fruit, and you will eat to satiety, and you will dwell securely upon it.

and you will dwell securely upon it - "securely" — and not scattered, and not afraid; "upon it" — and not in exile (Torath Cohanim). 108

25:20 And when you say: "What shall we eat in the seventh year if we cannot sow nor gather in our crops!"

And when you say - You are destined to say this (Ibid.). 109

nor gather in - R. Akiva said: If it cannot be sowed, how can it be gathered? What is the intent, then, of: "nor gather in"? From here we derive that the after-growths [of the previous crop] are forbidden on shevi'ith [i.e., it is this that we may not gather in] (Pesachim 51b).¹¹⁰

25:21 I shall command My blessing for you in the sixth year, and it shall produce its crop for three years.

for three years - It was taught: R. Yonathan b. Yosef says: "and it shall produce its crop for three years." Read it not "for three," but "for a third." [From here it is derived that the criterion for establishing something as the growth of a particular year is its having achieved a third of its growth] (Rosh Hashanah 13a).¹¹¹

25:22 And you shall sow the eighth year, and you shall eat of the crops "old." Until the ninth year, until its crop comes, shall you eat "old."

of the crops "old" - What is "old"? R. Nachman said: [The crop shall be] without worms. R. Shesheth said: Without blight (*Bava Bathra* 91b). 112

until its crop comes - It was taught: We might think that the Jews would wait anxiously for the new crop because of the depletion of the old or because of its inferior quality; it is, therefore, written: "until its crop comes" — until it comes of itself [without premature reaping because of such exigencies] (*Ibid.*).¹¹³

25:23 And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for Mine is the land; for strangers and settlers are you with Me.

shall not be sold in perpetuity - R. Chisda said in the name of R. Katina: Whence is it derived that if one sells his field for sixty years it does not return to him in the Jubilee year? From: "And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity." [Scripture speaks only of such land] which, if there were no Jubilee, would be sold in perpetuity and which, because of the Jubilee, is not sold in perpetuity — to exclude such land [as in the above case] which, even without the Jubilee, would not be sold in perpetuity (Bava Metzia 79a). 114,115

for Mine is the land - "Mine is the land" — Mine is the sanctity of the land. From here it is derived that there is no acquisition of land for a

gentile in Eretz Yisrael which [acquisition] would free it from the obligation of tithes (Gittin 47a).¹¹⁶

25:24 And in all the land of your holding, redemption shall you grant to the land.

And in all the land of your holding - "And in all" — to include houses and Hebrew man-servants as redeemable by kin (Kiddushin 21a). 117

25:25 If your brother grows poor and he sells of his holding, then shall come his redeemer who is near to him, and he shall redeem what his brother has sold.

If your brother grows poor - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one is not permitted to sell his field and place the proceeds in his moneybag to buy an animal, vessels, or a house? From: "If your brother grows poor," which teaches us that he should not sell [his field] unless he becomes impoverished (*Torath Cohanim*).¹¹⁸

and he sells of his holding - The Rabbis taught: What is the formula for a bill of sale? The seller writes: "My field is sold to you" [and the buyer does not write: "Your field is bought by me"]. Whence is this derived? From: "and he sells of his holding" — It is the seller that Scripture makes the principal (Kiddushin 9a). 119

and he sells of his holding - It was taught: I might think that one may sell all of his possessions at once; it is, therefore, written: "and he sells of his holding," and not all of his holding (*Torath Cohanim*).¹²⁰

and he sells of his holding - see first commentary on 25:13

then shall come his redeemer who is near to him - This teaches us that the nearest of kin takes precedence (*Ibid.*).¹²¹

and he shall redeem - He may do so [and the buyer cannot refuse him]. But perhaps it is incumbent upon him to do so! [This cannot be, for] it is written (26): "And a man, if there be for him no redeemer." Now is there a man in Israel who has no redeemers! [It must be speaking, then

of] one who has redeemers, who do not wish to redeem it, this option existing for them (Kiddushin 21a). 122

what his brother has sold - to include what he has given as a gift (Torath Cohanim). 123

25:26 And a man, if there be for him no redeemer, and his hand attain, and he find what suffices for its redemption,

if there be for him no redeemer - see commentary (122)

and his hand attain - The Rabbis taught: "and his hand attain" — his own hand, that he not borrow and redeem (Erchin 30b), 124

and he find - "and he find," to exclude what is already "found" — that he not sell a distant field to redeem one that is close or an inferior one to redeem one that is superior (*Ibid.*). 125

what suffices for its redemption - This teaches us that he redeems all at once and not by parts (*Erchin* 30b). 126

25:27 And he shall reckon the years of its sale and he shall return the balance to the man to whom he sold it, and he shall return to his holding.

and he shall return the balance - It was taught: R. Dostai b. Yehudah says: Whence is it derived that if he sold it for one hundred and it rose in value to two hundred, it is assessed at only one hundred? From: "and he shall return the balance" — the balance that he already possesses [in terms of its original value]. If he sold it for two hundred and it depreciated to one hundred, whence is it derived that it is assessed at only one hundred? From: "and he shall return the balance" — the balance [of the value of] the land. And whence is it derived that we always give the seller the advantage? Perhaps we should give it to the buyer! Do not entertain this notion, for we derive "redemption" [here] - "redemption," in respect to a Hebrew man-servant. [Just as in his redemption, the advantage is always his, and not the buyer's, so, here] (Ibid.). 127,128

to the man to whom he sold it - It was taught: If he sold it to the first for one hundred, and the first sold it to the second for two hundred, he makes the reckoning only with the first, as it is written: "to the man to whom he sold it." If he sold it to the first for two hundred, and the first sold it to the second for one hundred, he makes the reckoning only with the second, as it is written: "and he shall return the balance to the man" — to the man that is in it [i.e., that possesses it]. And whence is it derived that we always give the seller the advantage? Perhaps we should give it to the buyer! Do not entertain this notion, for we derive "redemption" [here] - "redemption," in respect to a Hebrew manservant. [Just as in his redemption, the advantage is always his, and not the buyer's, so, here] (Ibid.). 129-131

and he shall return to his holding - I [the L-rd] have spoken only of one who will return to his holding, and not of one who sells to another [for profit] (*Torath Cohanim*). 132

25:28 And if his hand does not find what suffices to restore it to himself, then his selling shall remain in the hand of its buyer until the Jubilee year, and it shall go out on the Jubilee, and he shall return to his holding.

until the Jubilee year - It must not enter into the year at all [i.e., on Rosh Hashanah it returns to the original owner]. In sum, fields and monies are released as one in the *shemitah* year; the Jubilee year releases in the beginning of the year, and the *shemitah* year at the end (*Ibid*.). 133,134

and it shall go out on the Jubilee - It was taught: The laws of fields of holding obtain only when the institution of the Jubilee year obtains, it being written: "and it shall go out on the Jubilee, and he shall return to his holding" (Erchin 29a).¹³⁵

and it shall go out on the Jubilee - even if it were dedicated to the Temple (Torath Cohanim). 136

and he shall return to his holding - R. Pappa said: If he sold stony ground and did not redeem it, it returns to him on the Jubilee year. Why so? For it is written: "and he shall return to his holding," and this, too,

is a "holding." If he sold trees and did not redeem them, they do not return to him. Why so? For it is written: "and he shall return to his holding," and trees are not a "holding" (*Erchin* 14b). ¹³⁷⁻¹³⁸

and he shall return to his holding - It was taught: R. Illa said: One who buys a field when the Jubilee is in force acquires the land [and not only the fruit]. R. Abba b. Memel, thereupon, said to him: If so, let him make any type of excavation he wishes in it! He answered [He may not do this, for] Scripture writes: "and he shall return to his holding" — in its original state (Yerushalmi Gittin 4:9). 139

and he shall return to his holding - [anyone who has a holding,] to include a woman (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁴⁰

- 25:29 And a man, if he sell a house of dwelling in a walled city, then its redemption shall be until the end of the year of its sale; [a year of] days shall be its redemption.
- a house of dwelling It was taught: A house which is not four by four ells in dimension is not agglomerated within the houses of a walled city [and if sold, returns to its original owner on the Jubilee year]. Why so? For "house" is stated in respect to the houses of a walled city [and a house lacking these dimensions is not technically subsumed within that term] (Succah 3b).¹⁴¹
- a house of dwelling see first commentary on 25:13
- a house of dwelling in a walled city which was walled [in the time of Joshua] and subsequently inhabited [by the Jews], and not one which was inhabited [by the Jews] and then walled. I might think [that the law applies] even if the Jews walled it [after they conquered it, before they inhabited it]; it is, therefore, written: "a walled city," and, elsewhere (Deuteronomy 3:5): "All of these were cities fortified by a wall" Just as there, gentiles [built the wall]; here, too, [the wall is required to have been built by] gentiles. And just as there, the [wall of the] gentiles preceded [the habitation by the Jews]; here, too, [it is required that the wall of] the gentiles precede [the habitation by the Jews] (Erchin 33b). 142-144

a walled city - Of which "walled city" does Scripture speak? A city which was [already] walled in the days of Joshua the son of Nun (Torath Cohanim). 145

then its redemption shall be - It was taught: If the seller died, his son may redeem it. And though it is written: "And a man, if he sell," and this man [i.e., the son,] did not sell it, still, he may redeem it. Whence is this derived? From: "then its redemption shall be" — in any manner (Erchin 31b). 146

then its redemption shall be - It was taught: If the buyer died, it may be redeemed from his son. And though it is written (30): "to the one who bought it," and this one did not buy it; still, it may be redeemed from him. Whence is this derived? From: "then its redemption shall be" — in any manner (Ibid.). ¹⁴⁷

the year of its sale - The Rabbis taught: The "year" mentioned in respect to the houses of walled cities is a full year [and not just a change of calendar year]. Whence is this derived? From: "until the end of the year of its sale" — [the year of] its sale, and not that of the calendar (*Ibid.* 18b). 148,149

[a year of] days shall be its redemption - What is the intent of "days"? To teach that the full day is required [i.e., if it were sold at mid-day, the "year" ends at mid-day of the following year] (*Ibid.* 31a). 150

25:30 And if it is not redeemed until its fulfillment of a complete year, then the house which is in the city which does not have a wall shall stand in perpetuity to the one who bought it throughout his generations; it shall not go out on the Jubilee year.

until its fulfillment of a year - The Rabbis taught: "a year" — I would not know whether a year from the first [sale] or a year from the second. "Until its [i.e., the house's and not the owner's] fulfillment of a year" indicates [that we are speaking of] a year from the first sale (*Ibid.* b). 151, 152

a complete year - to include a leap year (Ibid. a).153

a complete year - It was taught: R. Abba b. Memel said: If one sold two houses in a walled city, one on the fifteenth of I Adar, and the other on the first of II Adar, the year of the second expires on I Adar of the following year, whereas the year of the first does not expire until the *fifteenth* of Adar of the following year! [Why so? For it is written: "a complete year"] (*Ibid.* 31b). 154

the house which is in the city - The Rabbis taught: "the house" — This tells me only of a house. Whence do I derive [for inclusion in the law] olive-press sheds, bath-houses, towers and cave-like enclosures? From: "which is in the city." [If so,] I might think that even fields are included; it is, therefore, written: "the house" (Ibid. 32a). 155,156

which does not have a wall - it was taught: R. Eliezer b. R. Yossi says: "which does not have a wall" now, but did have one before [in the days of Joshua] (*Ibid.*). 157

which does not have a wall - to exclude a house which is built into the wall (Yerushalmi Ma'asroth 3:4).¹⁵⁸

in perpetuity [latzmituth] - The Rabbis taught: What is "latzmituth"? Forever. A variant interpretation: "latzmituth" — to include [in the law] a gift [and not only a sale]. Whence is this derived? From "tzamith" [singular], "tzmituth" [plural, implying both sale and gift] (Erchin 31b). 159

to the one who bought it throughout his generations - It was taught: A house in Jerusalem is not consigned in perpetuity, it being written: "then the house shall stand... to the one who bought it throughout his generations," it being held that Jerusalem was not apportioned among the tribes (Bava Kamma 82b). 160

to the one who bought it throughout his generations - "to the one who bought it" — even if [he bought it after] it had been dedicated to the Temple; "throughout his generations" — to exclude [from the law a house dedicated to] the Temple, which has no generations (Erchin 31b). 161

it shall not go out on the Jubilee year - It was taught: The law of the houses of walled cities applies only when the Jubilee is in force, it being written: "it shall not go out on the Jubilee year" (*Ibid.* 29a). 162

it shall not go out on the Jubilee year - Now if it is already written: "in perpetuity... throughout his generations," why need it be further written: "it shall not go out on the Jubilee year"! R. Safra answered: It is needed for an instance of a house in a walled city being sold and the Jubilee year falling out within the year of its sale. I might think that [in an instance of this kind] it should go out on the Jubilee year; we are, therefore, informed otherwise (Ibid.). 163,164

25:31 And the houses of open places, which have no wall roundabout; with the field of the land shall it be reckoned. Redemption shall there be for it, and on the Jubilee year it shall go out.

And the houses of open places - What are "houses of open places"? Two open places containing two houses each. [If there are no more than these in a given area,] though it was surrounded by a wall in the days of Joshua the son of Nun, it comes under the law of "houses of open places" (*Ibid.* 33b). 165

which have no wall - The Rabbis taught: From: "And the houses of open places," is it not obvious that they have no wall? Why must this be stated explicitly? [The teaching is:] though they do have a wall, [for halachic purposes] it is as if they have no wall (*Ibid.*). 166,167

wall roundabout - The Rabbis taught: "a wall," and not joined roofs; "roundabout" — to exclude Tiberias, whose wall [on one side] is the sea (*Ibid.* 32a). 168, 169

with the field of the land shall it be reckoned - Scripture likens it to a field of holding. Just as a field of holding is released by the Jubilee year and by paying the balance towards its redemption, so, houses of open places. [In that case,] I might think that just as a field of holding is not redeemed in less than two years, so houses of open places; it is, therefore, written: "Redemption shall there be for it" — immediately (Erchin 33a). 170,171

and on the Jubilee year it shall go out - It was taught: I might think that since they were given the advantages of both fields and houses [see

above] they do not go out on the Jubilee year; it is, therefore, written: "and on the Jubilee year it shall go out" (*Ibid.*).¹⁷²

25:32 And the cities of the Levites, the houses of the cities of their holding, a perpetual redemption shall there be for the Levites.

a perpetual redemption, etc. - Priests and Levites may always sell and always redeem, it being written: "a perpetual redemtpion shall there be for the Levites" (*Ibid.* b).¹⁷³

25:33 And one who buys [lit., "redeems"] from the Levites, then the selling of the house or the city of his holding shall go out on the Jubilee year; for the houses of the cities of the Levites are their holding in the midst of the children of Israel.

from the Levites - It was taught: I might think that a Levite may redeem from an Israelite [with all of the afore-mentioned "advantages"], the former being granted advantages and the latter not — but one Levite from another, both possessing advantages, perhaps not; it is, therefore, written: "from the Levites" [intimating that one Levite redeems from another] (Ibid.). 174,175

then the selling of the house shall go out - The "selling" [i.e., the sold house itself] goes out [without indemnification], but the improvements [e.g., trees, etc.,] do not go out [without indemnification to the buyer] (Bava Metzia 109a).¹⁷⁶

then the selling of the house shall go out - I might think that even its servants, and movables, and bills go out; it is, therefore, written: "the house or the city of his holding." If so, why mention "selling"? The selling goes out without indemnification, but what he had dedicated to the Temple, does not go out without indemnification, but only with redemption (Erchin 33a).¹⁷⁷

for the houses of the cities of the Levites - [The criterion is "the cities

of the Levites" (and not whether the owner himself is a Levite or an Israelite). Therefore, if an Israelite inherited his mother's father, a Levite, he redeems as the Levites do; and if a Levite inherited his mother's father, an Israelite, he redeems as an Israelite] (*Ibid.* b).¹⁷⁸

25:34 But the field of the open place of their cities shall not be sold, for it is a perpetual holding for them.

shall not be sold - It was taught: In the cities of the Levites, a field may not be converted to an open space, an open space to a field, an open space to a city, or a city to an open space, it being written: "But the field of the open place of their cities shall not be sold." What is the intent of "shall not be sold"? That they may not be sold at all? Its being written (32): "a perpetual redemption shall there be for the Levites" indicates that they can be sold. The meaning must be, then, that they may not be converted (Ibid.).¹⁷⁹

it is a perpetual holding for them - From here it is derived that the Levites may not consecrate their fields (*Ibid.* 28a). 180

25:35 And if your brother grows poor, and his hand falls with you, then you shall uphold him, as a convert and as a sojourner; and he shall live with you.

And if your brother grows poor - Rabbah b. Avahu found Elijah and asked him: Must one make an "arrangement" for a debtor? [i.e., When estimating the value of his property to pay off his creditors, must it be arranged that a certain amount of food and clothing be left for him?] He answered: It is written: "And if your brother grows poor," and, in respect to erchin ["valuations" of human beings for sacred purposes] (Leviticus 27:8): "And if he is too poor." Just as in the case of valuations, "arrangements" are made, in the case of a debtor, too, "arrangements" are made (Bava Metzia 114a). 181, 182

And if your brother grows poor - see first commentary on 25:13

and his hand falls - Do not allow him to drop. To what may this be compared? To a [slipping] burden upon an ass. So long as it is still in its

place, one can grab onto it and set it right. Once it has fallen to the ground, not even five can get it back again (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁸³

then you shall uphold him - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one "upheld" him four or five times he must [if necessary] continue doing so? From: "then you shall uphold him" [connoting continuity in the Hebrew]. I might think that he must do so even if he thereby assists him in some evil end; it is, therefore, written: "with you" [i.e., only if he is "with you" in Torah observance] (*Ibid.*). 184,185

as a convert and as a sojourner [ger vetoshav] - "ger" — this is a ger tzedek [a righteous convert, one who accepts all the mitzvoth]; "toshav" — this is a convert who eats carrion [but abstains from idolatry] (Ibid.). 186

25:36 Do not take from him interest or increase, and you shall fear your G-d, and your brother shall live with you.

Do not take from him - It was taught: If a father left his children money taken as interest, they need not return it, it being written: "Do not take from him interest or increase" — return it to him so that he may live [see end of verse]; it is the taker that Scripture exhorts, and not his children (Bava Kamma 112a). 187

Do not take from him - "Do not take from him," but you may act as his guarantor [for a loan on interest that he took from a gentile] (Bava Metzia 71a).¹⁸⁸

Do not take from him - These transgress one negative commandment: the lender and the borrower. And the guarantor, the witnesses, and the scribe transgress (37): "Your money do not give him on interest," and: "Do not take from him interest" (*Ibid.* 75b). 189

interest or increase - Which is "interest," and which is "increase"? "Interest" [neshech] is lending a sela for five dinars [which are more than a sela]; two sa'ah of grain for three. "Increase" [tarbith] is increasing [one's wealth, (at the expense of another) not through lending, but through a variation in the market price of] fruits (Ibid. 60b). 190

and you shall fear your G-d - Whatever is relegated to the heart [e.g., in this context, lending out one's own money on interest on the pretense that it is a gentile's, the wrongness being known only to the heart of the doer] — of such things it is written: "And you shall fear your G-d" [who probes the heart] (Kiddushin 32b).¹⁹¹

and your brother shall live with you - It was taught: R. Elazar said: If a stipulated sum of interest is exacted, it is reclaimed [from the taker] by beth-din. Why so? For it is written: "Do not take from him interest or increase" — return it to him so that he may live [together with you] (Bava Metzia 62a).¹⁹²

and your brother shall live with you - It was taught: If two men are walking along the road and one has a jug of water: if they both drink, they will both die [there not being enough to keep both alive]; if one drinks, he will reach the settlement. [What is the halachah?] R. Akiva expounded: "and your brother shall live with you" — your life comes before that of your neighbor (Ibid.). 193, 194

and your brother shall live with you - "your brother," and not an ox [i.e., one may kill animals so that he may live] (Ibid. 88b). 195

25:37 Your money you shall not give him on interest, and on increase you shall not give your food.

Your money, etc. - "Your money," and not that of others [i.e., gentiles]; and "your food," and not that of others (Torath Cohanim). 196

Your money, etc. - This tells me only of [the prohibition of] money on interest and food on increase. Whence do I derive [the same for] food on interest? From (Deuteronomy 23:20): "interest of food." Whence do I derive [the same for] money on increase? From (Ibid.): "interest of money." If this is not needed to inform us of [the prohibition of] interest of money, it already being written (Ibid.): "Do not give interest to your brother...anything that is given on interest," understand it as applying to increase on money. And this tells me only of [the prohibition upon] the lender. Whence do I derive it for the borrower? It is written here [Deuteronomy] "interest" in respect to the lender, and, elsewhere [our verse] "interest" in respect to the borrower. Just as the

"interest" mentioned in respect to the lender does not distinguish between money and food, between interest and increase, so, the "interest" mentioned in respect to the borrower does not distinguish between money and food, between interest and increase (*Bava Metzia* 61a). 197

you shall not give him - There is no "increase" without "interest," and no "interest" without "increase," Scripture distinguishing between them only to render the violator liable for two transgressions (*Ibid.* 60b). 198

you shall not give him - This teaches us that the Torah forbade only interest which comes from the borrower to the lender [but it did not forbid the receiving of money by an agent to negotiate loans] (*Ibid.* 69b). 199

25:38 I am the L-rd your G-d, who took you out of the land of Egypt to give to you the land of Canaan, to be a G-d to you.

I am the L-rd, etc. - Why mention the Exodus in the context of interest? [It is as if] the Holy One Blessed be He were saying: I am He who discriminated in Egypt between the drop [i.e., semen,] of the first-born and the drop of the non-first-born. It is I who am destined to [discern and to] exact punishment from him who pretends his money to be a gentile's and lends it out to a Jew on interest (*Ibid.* 61b).²⁰⁰

to be a G-d to you, etc. - The Rabbis taught: Let one always live in Eretz Yisrael, even in a city where the majority are gentiles, rather than outside Eretz Yisrael, even in a city where the majority are Jews. For all who live in Eretz Yisrael are considered to have a G-d, and all who live outside Eretz Yisrael are likened to idolators, it being written: "to give to you the Land of Canaan, to be a G-d to you" (Kethuvoth 110b).²⁰¹

25:39 And if your brother grows poor with you, and he is sold to you, do not work with him the work of a servant.

And if your brother grows poor - It was taught: Whence is it derived

that one is not permitted to sell himself [as a servant] and to place the proceeds in his money-bag to buy an animal, vessels, or a house? From: "And if your brother grows poor... and is sold to you," which teaches us that he should not sell himself unless he becomes impoverished (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁰²

And if your brother grows poor, etc. - He is called "your brother," and he is called "a servant." How is this to be reconciled? *You* conduct yourself towards him as a brother; *he* conducts himself as a servant (*Ibid.*).²⁰³

and he is sold to you - It was taught: One who sells himself may do so for six or for more than six years. Whence is this derived? Scripture states a limitation in respect to one who is sold by beth-din (Deuteronomy 15:12): "and he shall serve you six years" — this one [i.e., one sold by beth-din] does not serve more than six years, but one who sells himself may serve more than six years (Kiddushin 14b).²⁰⁴

and he is sold to you - It was taught: Whence is it derived that when he is sold, he is sold only to a Jew? From: "and he is sold to you" (Torath Cohanim).²⁰⁵

and he is sold to you - see first commentary on 25:13

do not work with him, etc. - "with him" do not work the work of a servant, but you may work the work of a servant with a free man (*Ibid*.).²⁰⁶

the work of a servant - What is "the work of a servant" [that he is not to do for you]? He shall not carry you in a sedan-chair, and he shall not carry your things before you to the bath-house (*Ibid.*).²⁰⁷

25:40 As a hired man and as a sojourner shall he be with you; until the Jubilee year shall he work with you.

As a hired man and as a sojourner - The Torah likens him to a hired man and to a sojourner, viz.: just as a hired man (*Deuteronomy* 24:15): "On his day shall you give him his hire," so, this one: "On his day shall you give him his hire." And just as a sojourner (*Deuteronomy* 23:17): "... what is good for him; you shall not oppress him," so, this one:

"... what is good for him; you shall not oppress him" (Ibid.).208

shall he be with you - This teaches us that the master cannot say to his Hebrew man-servant: "Work for me, but I will not feed you" (Kethuvoth 43a).²⁰⁹

until the Jubilee year - This teaches us that a Hebrew man-servant "reacquires" himself in the Jubilee year (Kiddushin 17a). 210

until the Jubilee year - The institution of the Hebrew man-servant obtains only when that of the Jubilee obtains, as it is written: "until the Jubilee year shall he work with you" (Erchin 29a).²¹¹

shall he work with you - What is the intent of "with you"? Do not engage his craft to another. If he were formerly a public bath-house attendant, a barber to the public, or a baker to the public, do not engage him [for this to another]. R. Yossi says: If this were his trade before [he became a servant], he may thus be engaged (Torath Cohanim).²¹²

25:41 Then he shall go out from you; and his children with him.

And he shall return to his family, and to the holding of his fathers shall he return.

Then he shall go out from you - [What is meant by "from you"? From your place]. This teaches us that you should not be in the village and he in the town, or you in the town and he in the village (*Ibid.*).²¹³

he and his children with him - It was taught: R. Shimon said: If he is sold, are his children sold! What is the intent of: "and his children"? To teach that the master is responsible for the feeding of his children (Kiddushin 22a).²¹⁴

And he shall return to his family - It was taught: R. Elazar b. Yaakov said: Of what is Scripture speaking? If of one who sells himself, this has already been mentioned. If of a nirtza [one who elected life-long servitude], this has also been mentioned. It must be speaking, then, of one sold by beth-din two or three years before the Jubilee year, as subject to release by the Jubilee year (Ibid. 15a). 215

And he shall return to his family - A servant who is a priest may not

become a *nirtza* [one who has his ear bored as a sign of subjection to life-long servitude], for he thereby sustains a blemish. Let him sustain it then! Rava b. R. Shila said: It is written: "And he shall return to his family" — to the *status* [in this case, the priestly status,] of his family [and blemishes invalidate one for the priestly service] (Kiddushin 21b).²¹⁶

And he shall return to his family - It was taught: A convert cannot be acquired as a Hebrew man-servant. Why so? For it is written: "And he shall return to his family," and a convert has no [Jewish] family [i.e., parents] (Bava Metzia 71a).²¹⁷

And he shall return to his family - It is to his family that he returns, but not to the station of eminence he may previously have held therein (Makkoth 13a).²¹⁸

25:42 For they are My servants, whom I took out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as servants are sold.

they shall not be sold - It was taught: Whence is the exhortation against kidnapping derived? R. Yashiah said: From (Exodus 19:13): "You shall not steal." R. Yochanan says: From: "they shall not be sold as servants are sold." And there is no dispute. One addresses himself to the transgression of stealing, and the other, to that of selling (Sanhedrin 86a).²¹⁹

as servants are sold - They shall not be stood up in public and sold upon the auction block (*Torath Cohanim*).²²⁰

For they are My servants - My deed with them is first, for I took them out of the land of Egypt on condition that they not be sold as servants are sold (*Ibid.*).²²¹

25:43 You shall not rule over him oppressively, and you shall fear your G-d.

You shall not rule over him, etc. - [What is the intent of: "You shall not rule over him"?] Do not tell him: "Heat up this cup for me," if you have no need of it; "Dig under this grape-vine until I come." And lest

you say: "I really do need it," such things are relegated to the heart [i.e., of what one knows to be true in his heart]; and of all things that are relegated to the heart, it is written: "and you shall fear your G-d" [who probes the heart] (*Ibid.*).²²²

25:44 And your man-servant and your maid-servant, which will be to you, from the nations which are around you; of them shall you buy a man-servant and a maid-servant.

And your man-servant and your maid-servant, etc. - What is the intent of this? Lest you say: "If all of these are forbidden to us, who shall serve us?" it is written: "And your man-servant and your maid-servant... from the nations, etc." (Ibid.).²²³

which will be to you - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if a Jew lived with his maid-servant and begot a son by her you are permitted to make him your servant? From: "which will be to you" (*Ibid.*).²²⁴

which are around you - "which are around you," and not from the Canaanites in the land [whom it is a mitzvah to destroy] (Ibid.).²²⁵

of them shall you buy - What is the intent of this? I might think [that "from the nations" implies that I may buy] only their sons and their daughters. Whence would I derive that they themselves [may be bought]? It is, therefore, written: "of them [i.e., they themselves] shall you buy" (Ibid.).²²⁶

25:45 And also of the sons of the sojourners, who sojourn among you, of them may you buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begot in your land; and they shall be to you for a holding.

And also of the sons of the sojourners - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if a man of one of the nations [other than the seven nations that it is a mitzvah to destroy] lived with a Canaanite woman and begot a son by her, you are permitted to buy him as a servant? From: "And also of the sons of the sojourners [i.e., of those who do not live in the land, as the seven nations do, but who only sojourn in it] may you buy"

[the child (in the gentile nations) being regarded as the father's (vis à vis nationality) and not as the mother's] (Yevamoth 78b).²²⁷

which they begot in your land - I might think that even if a Canaanite lived with a woman of one of the nations and begot a son by her you are permitted to buy him as a servant; it is, therefore, written: "which they begot in your land" [i.e., which non-Canaanite fathers begot of Canaanite women, who live in your land], but not "who sojourn in your land" [i.e., not sons begotten by Canaanite fathers outside of the land, who (i.e., the sons) subsequently came to sojourn in the land] (Ibid.).²²⁸

of them may you buy - You may buy of them, but they may not buy of you; and they may not buy of each other to acquire one's body [but only his labor] (*Ibid.* 46a).²²⁹

25:46 And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons after you to inherit as a holding. Forever shall you have them serve you. And in your brothers, the children of Israel, one man in his brother, you shall not rule over him oppressively.

And you shall hold them as an inheritance - [I might think that a Hebrew man-servant and a Hebrew maid-servant could be acquired through "chazakah" ("holding"): it is, therefore, written:] "And you shall hold them as an inheritance" — "them" [i.e., gentile servants] through "holding," but not others through "holding" (Kiddushin 16a).²³⁰

And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons - It was taught: "And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons" — "them" for your sons, and not your daughters for your sons. This teaches us that a father does not pass on the possessions of his daughter to his son [after his death]; and from here we derive that the grant of the Hebrew maid-servant belongs to her (*Ibid.* b).²³¹

And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons - R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If one's daughter is supported by her brothers [instead of by himself], what she earns belongs to her [and not to the father], as it is written: "And you shall hold them as an inheritance for

your sons" — "them" for your sons, and not your daughters for your sons. This teaches us that a father does not pass on the possessions of his daughter to his sons (Kethuvoth 43a).²³²

And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons - R. Shimon b. Yochai taught: "And you shall give to the maiden" — "And he shall give to the father of the maiden" (*Deuteronomy* 22:19,25) [i.e., The implication is that he shall give to both the maiden and her father] How is this to be reconciled? If her case were adjudicated before her father's death — "And he shall give to the *father* of the maiden"; if her father died [before it were adjudicated] — "And he shall give to the maiden." Whence is this derived? From: "And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons" — "them" for your sons, and not your daughters for your sons" (Yerushalmi Kethuvoth 4:1).^{233,234}

for your sons after you - "for your sons," and not for your daughters. From here it is derived that sons inherit the father and not daughters [where there are sons] (Bava Bathra 110b).²³⁵

for your sons after you - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one who is regarded *de facto* as one's son is considered his son for all purposes? From: "And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons *after you*" [connoting "who are regarded as yours"] (*Torath Cohanim*).²³⁶

to inherit as a holding - It was taught: Whence is it derived that servants are likened to land? From: "And you shall hold them [the servants] as an inheritance for your sons after you to inherit as a holding" [connoting "land"] (Megillah 23b).²³⁷

to inherit as a holding - Scripture likens gentile servants to a field of holding, viz.: just as a field of holding is acquired by money, deed, and chazakah [an act of "holding"], so, a gentile servant is acquired by money, deed and chazakah (Kiddushin 22b).²³⁸

to inherit as a holding - I might think that a gentile maid-servant could be acquired through cohabitation; it is, therefore, written: "And you shall hold them as an inheritance for your sons after you to inherit as a holding." They are likened to a field of holding. Just as a field of holding is acquired by money, deed, and chazakah, so is this one [a

gentile maid-servant] acquired by money, deed, and chazakah — and not by cohabitation (Yerushalmi Kiddushin 1:1).²³⁹

to inherit as a holding - Scripture likens a field of holding to a [gentile] servant. Just as with servants, you buy of them [their bodies], but they do not buy of you [your bodies, but only your labor], so a field of holding, you buy of them [the field itself], but they do not buy of you [the field itself, but only its fruits]. From here it is derived that there is no acquisition of land by gentiles in Eretz Yisrael to exempt it from the obligation of tithes (Yerushalmi Gittin 4:9).²⁴⁰

Forever shall you have them serve you - I might think that since servants are likened to a field of holding [in respect to acquisition], they are similarly likened to it in respect to return on the Jubilee year, viz.: just as a field of holding returns to its original owner on the Jubilee year, so a Canaanite servant; it is, therefore, written: "Forever shall you have them serve you" (Kiddushin 22b).²⁴¹

Forever shall you have them serve you - It was taught: R. Akiva says: "Forever shall you have them serve you" — this is an obligation [i.e., it is forbidden to free them] (Gittin 38b).²⁴²

Forever shall you have them serve you - It was taught: R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: "One who frees his [gentile] servant transgresses a positive commandment, namely: "Forever shall you have them serve you" (*Ibid.*).²⁴³

Forever shall you have them serve you - Shmuel said: For service have I given him to you and not for shame [i.e., You must treat him respectfully] (Niddah 47a).²⁴⁴

And in your brothers - It was taught: Whence is it derived that it is permitted to exact servitude from one [a Jew] whose behavior is unseemly? From: "Forever shall you have them serve you, and your brothers." [In that case,] I might think [that one could do so] even if his behavior were seemly; it is, therefore, written: "And in your brothers, the children of Israel, one man in his brother, you shall not rule over him" (Bava Metzia 73b).^{245,246}

one man in his brother - This tells me only of a man vis à vis a man. Whence do I derive the same for a man vis à vis a woman and a woman

vis à vis a man? From: "one man in his brother" — in any event [of "brotherhood"] (Torath Cohanim).²⁴⁷

you shall not rule over him - "You shall not rule over him oppressively," but you may do so with a free man [who hires himself out for such labor] (*Ibid.*).²⁴⁸

25:47 And if the hand of a stranger and sojourner attain with you, and your brother grow poor with him, and he be sold to the stranger sojourning with you or to the uprooted of the family of a stranger,

And if ... attain - It was taught: "And if the hand of a stranger and sojourner attain with you." What caused his growing rich? His attachment to you. "And your brother grow poor with him." What caused his growing poor? His attachment to him (*Ibid.*).²⁴⁹

or to the uprooted of the family of a stranger - see first commentary on 25:13

25:48 After he is sold, redemption shall there be for him; one of his brothers shall redeem him.

After he is sold - It was taught: If one came and said: "I am going to sell myself," I might think that one must help him [and redeem him]; it is, therefore, written: "After he is sold," which teaches us that he is not helped until after he is sold (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁵⁰

redemption shall there be for him - It was taught in the school of R. Yishmael: I might think that since he made himself a priest for idolatry [see first commentary on 25:13], "Let the stone be thrust upon the fallen," it is, therefore, written: "redemption shall there be for him" (Kiddushin 20b).²⁵¹

redemption shall there be for him - R. Akiva expounded: Whence is it derived that it is forbidden to steal from idolators? From: "After he is sold [to the idolator], redemption [that is, monetary redemption,] shall there be for him" — he may not be seized from the gentile (Bava Kamma 113b).²⁵²

redemption shall there be for him - "redemption shall there be for him" — immediately; do not allow him to become assimilated (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁵³

one of his brothers shall redeem him - It was taught: Whence is it derived that his paternal brother takes precedence to his maternal brother [in respect to redemption]? From "one of his brothers shall redeem him" (*Ibid.*).²⁵⁴

25:49 Or his uncle, or his uncle's son shall redeem him; or those of his near of kin of his family shall redeem him; or if his hand attain, he shall be redeemed.

Or his uncle, or his uncle's son, etc. - "his uncle" — this is his father's brother; "his uncle's son" — this is the son of his father's brother (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁵⁵

or those of his near of kin - This teaches that the nearest of kin take precedence (*Ibid.*).²⁵⁶

of his family shall redeem him - The family of the father is called "family" [for halachic purposes]; the family of the mother is not called "family" (Yevamoth 54b).²⁵⁷

shall redeem him - Why mention "shall redeem him" three times? To include all redemptions [i.e., those of houses in open cities and of fields of holding] in this order [of precedence] (Kiddushin 21a). 258,259

or if his hand attain " — his own hand [i.e., he is not constrained to borrow] (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁶⁰

he shall be redeemed - It was taught: "he shall be redeemed" — all to freedom [i.e., whoever redeems him may not keep him as a servant] (Kiddushin 15b).²⁶¹

he shall be redeemed - by any man [i.e., It is a mitzvah for any Jew to redeem him, not only a relative] (Torath Cohanim).²⁶²

25:50 And he shall reckon with his buyer from the year that he

was sold to him until the Jubilee year. And the money of his selling shall be according to the number of years; according to the days of a hired man shall he be with him.

And he shall reckon with his buyer - What is the intent of: "And he shall reckon with his buyer"? He shall be exact with his buyer (*Bava Kamma* 113b).²⁶³

with his buyer - It was taught: One who is sold to a gentile serves neither his son nor his daughter, it being written: "And he shall reckon with his buyer" — and not with the heirs of his buyer (Kiddushin 17b).²⁶⁴

with his buyer - Rava said: According to the Torah, a gentile inherits his father, it being written: "And he shall reckon with his buyer," concerning which it was taught: and not with the heirs of his buyer, the implication being that he does, indeed, have heirs (*Ibid.*).²⁶⁵

And the money of his selling shall be - see commentary (267)

25:51 If there are yet many in the years, according to them shall he return his redemption from the money of his acquisition.

If there are yet many in the years - It was taught: "If there are yet many in the years ... And if few are left in the years." Now are there years that are many and years that are few? [The intent is, rather, that] if his money increased [i.e., if he is worth more now, before his redemption, than he was worth when he was bought, then the redemption fee is reckoned] according to the money of his acquisition; and if his money decreased [i.e., if he is worth less before his redemption than he was worth when he was bought, then the fee is reckoned] according to his years [of service based on his pre-redemption value, so that by either reckoning, the redemption fee is less] (*Ibid.* 20b).²⁶⁶

shall he return his redemption, etc. - It was taught: He acquires himself [i.e., his freedom,] with money or with objects of monetary value. With money, it being written: "from the money of his acquisition"; with objects of monetary value, it being written: "shall he return his

redemption" — to include objects of monetary value as equivalent to money [in this connection] (Kiddushin 16a).²⁶⁷

from the money of his acquisition - This teaches us that he is acquired with money and not with grain or vessels; and this is so only when they are not worth one *prutah*". If so, this is true of money also! [Why, then, exclude only grain and vessels that are not worth one *prutah*?] I might think that because grain and vessels afford immediate enjoyment he agrees to be acquired for them [even though they are not worth one *prutah*]; we, therefore, need to be informed otherwise (*Ibid.* 8a). ^{268,269}

from the money of his acquisition - This teaches us that he is acquired with money. Whence do we derive the same rule for one who sells himself [to a Jew]? We derive it: "hired man" [here] - "hired man" (*Deuteronomy* 15:18) [in respect to one who is sold by *beth-din*] (*Ibid.* 14b).²⁷⁰

from the money of his acquisition - The Rabbis taught: If he were sold for one hundred and appreciated in value to two hundred, whence do we derive that the redemption fee is reckoned on the basis of one hundred? From: "from the money of his acquisition." Whence do we derive [the same rule for] one who sells himself to a Jew? From: "hired man" [here] - "hired man" (Deuteronomy 15:18) [in respect to one who is sold by halachah] (Ibid. 20a). [and see commentary (266)]^{271,272}

25:52 And if few are left in the years until the Jubilee year, then he shall reckon with him; according to his years shall he return his redemption.

according to his years - The Rabbis taught: If he were sold for two hundred and depreciated in value to one hundred, whence do we derive that the redemption fee is reckoned on the basis of one hundred? From: "according to his years." Whence do we derive [the same rule for] one who sells himself to a Jew? From: "hired man"-"hired man" [see above] (*Ibid.*). [and see commentary (266)]^{273,274}

25:53 As a hired man, year by year, shall he be with him; he shall not rule over him oppressively before your eyes.

As a hired man, year by year - It was taught: Hire is paid only at the end [of the period], it being written: "As a hired man year by year." The hire for this year is paid only at the beginning of the next year [and is not to be understood as owing at the beginning of the period of hire. This has numerous halachic implications] (Bava Metzia 65a).²⁷⁵

he shall not rule over him oppressively before your eyes - It was taught: I might think that one should enter his [the gentile's] house to discover what is being done to him [the servant]; it is, therefore, written: "before your eyes" — you are commanded only in respect to what you see before your eyes (*Torath Cohanim*).²⁷⁶

25:54 And if he not be redeemed with these, then he shall go out on the Jubilee year; he and his children with him.

And if he not be redeemed with these - What is the intent of "with these"? To teach: "with these" he is redeemed, and he is not redeemed with [the passage of] six years [as is one who is sold to a Jew] (Kiddushin 15b).²⁷⁷

25:55 For to Me are the children of Israel servants. They are My servants, whom I took out of the land of Egypt; I am the L-rd, your G-d.

For to Me are the children of Israel servants - It was taught: R. Yochanan b. Zakkai expounded: Why was the ear singled out from all the other organs of the body to be bored [as a sign of life-long servitude]? The Holy One Blessed be He said [as it were]: "The ear that heard on Mount Sinai: 'For to Me are the children of Israel servants'—and not servants to servants—and this one went and acquired a master for himself; let his ear be bored!" (Ibid. 22b).²⁷⁸

For to Me are the children of Israel servants - Rav said: A worker may give up his job even in the middle of the [working] day; for it is written: "For to Me are the children of Israel servants"— and not servants to servants (Bava Kamma 116b).²⁷⁹

For to Me are the children of Israel servants - see commentary on Deuteronomy 14:1

26:1 Do not make for yourselves idols, and a graven image or a pillar you shall not upraise for yourselves, and a covering stone you shall not place in your land to bow down upon it, for I am the L-rd your G-d.

Do not make, etc. - This is explained in Jethro and in Kedoshim

you shall not upraise - Are not "making" and "upraising" one and the same? R. Hilla said: "Making" refers to the initial act; "upraising" — if any of these fall, do not raise them up again (Yerushalmi Avodah Zarah 4:4).1

and a covering stone - Ulla said: This teaches us that Scripture forbade a stone floor in and of itself [i.e., without reference to idol worship, such a floor being permitted only in the Temple] (Megillah 22b).²

in your land to bow down upon it - You may not bow down upon it in your land [in general]; but you may bow down upon the stones in the Temple (*Ibid.*).³

to bow down upon it - Ulla said: Scripture forbade bowing only with spread-out hands and legs (*Ibid.*).⁴

to bow down upon it - [From: "you shall not place"] I might think that it is forbidden to place one stone atop another to set one's basket upon; it is, therefore written: "to bow down upon it." It is forbidden to bow down upon it, but it is permitted to set one's basket upon it (Yerushalmi Avodah Zarah 4:1).5

26:2 My Sabbaths shall you keep, and My sanctuary shall you fear; I am the L-rd.

My Sabbaths shall you keep, etc. - What is the intent of this [in this context]? It is stated in respect to one who sells himself to a gentile—that he not say: Since my master serves idols and desecrates the Sabbath, I shall, too. — "My Sabbaths shall you keep, and My sanctuary you shall fear; I am the L-rd" (Torath Cohanim).6

Bechukothai

26:3 If in My statutes you walk, and My *mitzvoth* you keep, to do them.

If in My statutes you walk - The Rabbis taught: "If in My statutes you walk" — "If" is a term of imploration [i.e., "Would that"], as in (Psalms 81:14): "Would that My people would hearken to Me; in a short while I would humble their enemies," and (Isaiah 48:18): "Would that you had hearkened to My mitzvoth; then your peace would have been as a river" (Avodah Zarah 5a).

If in My statutes you walk, etc. - It was taught: R. Meir says: Any condition which is not like that of the sons of Gad and the sons of Reuven [i.e., a "double condition," stating both the condition and its converse] is not a condition, as it is written: "If in My statutes you walk...(16) And if My statutes you despise" (Kiddushin 61b).8

If in My statutes you walk, etc. - It was taught: R. Levi said: Come and see that not as the measure of the Holy One Blessed be He is that of flesh and blood. For the Holy One Blessed be He blessed Israel with twenty-two blessings, from "If in My statutes" [beginning with the first letter of the alphabet, aleph] and ending with (13) "upright" ["kommemiuth," which ends with the last letter of the alphabet, tav, giving a total of twenty-two (i.e., the full range of blessing, from aleph until tav)], and He cursed them with eight curses, from (16): "And if in My statutes you despise" [beginning with the letter vav] and ending with (43) "and My statutes were abhorred by their souls" ["nafsham," which ends with the letter mem, eight letters from the vav to the mem], whereas Moses our teacher blessed them with eight blessings [from the vav of "vehayah im shamoa" (Deuteronomy 28:1) until the mem of "le'avdam" (Ibid. 14)], and he cursed them with twenty-two curses [from the vav of "vahaya im lo tishma" (Ibid. 15) until the heh of "ve'ein

koneh" (Ibid. 68), twenty-two letters from the vav to the heh] (Bava Bathra 88b). 9-11

If in My statutes you walk, etc. - It was taught: "If in My statutes you walk" — these are the mitzvoth. But it is written: "and My mitzvoth you keep, to do them" — Mitzvoth are already stated! How, then, am I to understand: "If in My statutes you walk"? That you must labor in Torah (Torath Cohanim). 12

26:4 Then I shall give your rains in their proper times, and the earth shall yield its produce, and the tree of the field shall yield its fruit.

Then I shall give your rains - "your rains," and not the rains of all the lands. There will be plenty in Eretz Yisrael and hunger in all of the lands, and they will come and buy from you and enrich you (*Ibid.*).¹³

your rains in their proper times - What is "in their proper times"? Neither "drunk" nor "thirsty," but the middle state [i.e., the earth will be neither over-saturated nor parched, but in optimum condition for cultivation]. Another interpretation: On Wednesday and Sabbath eves [when people are in their houses and are not inconvenienced by the rain] (Ta'anith 22b). 14,15

and the tree of the field, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that non-fruit-producing trees are also destined to yield fruit? From: "and the tree of the *field* [which usually does not produce fruit] will yield its fruit" (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁶

And your threshing will reach the vintage, and the vintage will reach the sowing, and you will eat your bread in satiety, and you will dwell securely in your land.

and you will eat your bread in satiety - The intent is not that one will eat much and be sated, but rather that he will eat little and be "blessed in his intestines," as it is written (*Exodus* 23:25): "And He will bless your bread and your water" (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁷

and you will dwell securely in your land - "in your land" you dwell securely, but not outside it (Ibid.). 18

26:6 And I will put peace in the land, and you will lie down and not tremble; and I will eliminate evil beasts from the land, and a sword shall not pass through your land.

and a sword shall not pass - What is intended by "sword"? If a sword of war — it is already written: "And I will put peace in the land"! The intent must be, then, even a sword of peace [i.e., an army passing through Eretz Yisrael to attack a different land] (Ta'anith 22b).19

- 26:7 And you will pursue your enemies, and they will fall before you by the sword.
- And there will pursue of you, five, one hundred; and one hundred of you will pursue ten thousand, and your enemies will fall before you by the sword.

And there will pursue of you - "of you" — of the weakest among you, and not of the strongest (Torath Cohanim).²⁰

and one hundred of you, etc. - Now is this the count? [i.e., If five pursue one hundred, then, proportionately, five hundred should be pursuing ten thousand] [The answer must be, then, that] there is no comparison between many who observe the Torah and few who observe it [the many, having, proportionately, far more power] (Ibid.).²¹

- 26:9 And I shall turn to you, and I shall make you fruitful, and I shall establish My covenant with you.
- 26:10 And you will eat the old grown old; and you will remove the old in the face of the new.

And you will eat the old grown old - This teaches us that whatever is

older than the other is better than the other. And this tells us only of things [i.e., fruits] which normally mature. Whence is it derived that the same will apply for those things which do not normally mature? From: "old grown old" — in any event (Bava Bathra 91b).²²

and you will remove the old in the face of the new. This teaches us that the store-houses will be full of the old and the granaries full of the new, and the Jews will say: "How can we remove this to make place for that?" (Ibid.).²³

26:11 And I will place My tabernacle in your midst and My soul will not abhor you.

And I will place My tabernacle in your midst - It was taught: Whence is it derived that the sanctuary [i.e., the Temple] is also referred to as the "tabernacle"? From: "And I will place My tabernacle in your midst." [The tabernacle proper already being in their midst, "tabernacle" here must refer to the Temple] (Eruvin 2a).²⁴

- 26:12 And I will walk in your midst, and I will be unto you, a G-d, and you will be unto Me, a people.
- 26:13 I am the L-rd your G-d, who took you out of the land of Egypt, so that you not be slaves to them; and I will break the bars of your yoke, and I will make you walk upright.

upright ["komemiuth"] - What is the intent of "komemiuth"? It was taught: R. Meir says: Two hundred ells, twice the height of Adam [i.e., "komah" = one height; "komemiuth" = two heights]. R. Yehudah says: One hundred ells, corresponding to the sanctuary [i.e., the second Temple] and its walls [which were one hundred ells in height], as it is written (Psalms 144:12): "For our sons are as plants grown up in their youth; our daughters as corner-stones, fashioned as the form of the sanctuary" (Bava Bathra 75a). 25-27

26:14 And if you do not hearken to Me, and do not do all of these mitzvoth,

And if you do not hearken to Me - I might think that the reference is to what is written in the Torah. But it is already written: "and do not do all of these mitzvoth"! How, then, am I to understand: "And if you do not hearken to Me"? As referring to the interpretations of the sages (Torath Cohanim).²⁸

And if you do not hearken to Me - What is the intent of "to Me"? The verse refers to "one who knows his Master and wilfully rebels against Him" (*Ibid.*).²⁹

- 26:15 And if My statutes you despise, and if My judgments, your souls abhor, not to do all of My mitzvoth, to break My covenant,
- 26:16 I, too, will do this to you, and I shall visit terror upon you: consumption and fever, dimming the eyes and plaguing the soul; and you shall sow your seed in vain, for your foes shall eat it.

and I shall visit terror [behalah] upon you - It was taught: R. Elazar b. R. Yehudah says: Because of the sin of [omission to separate] chalah, there is no blessing in the gathered-in grain, the market is blighted, and seed is sown for others to enjoy, as it is written: "and I shall visit behalah upon you...and you shall sow your seed in vain, for your foes shall eat it." Read it not "behalah," but "bachalah" ["because of the chalah"] (Shabbath 32b). 30

- 26:17 And I shall set My face against you, and you will be smitten before your foes, and your foes shall rule over you; and you shall flee when none pursue you.
- 26:18 And if with these you do not hearken to Me, then I shall chastise you even more, seven-fold for your sins.

26:19 And I shall break the pride of your strength, and I shall make your sky as iron and your earth as brass.

And I shall break the pride of your strength - R. Yosef taught: These are the dignitaries of Yehudah (Gittin 37a).31

26:20 And your power shall be spent in vain, and your land will not yield its produce, and the tree of the field will not yield its fruit

And your power shall be spent in vain - This refers to one who marries off his daughter with a great dowry; but before the seven days of rejoicing are completed, his daughter dies — so that he buries his daughter and loses his wealth (*Torath Cohanim*).³²

- 26:21 And if you walk with Me laxly and do not desire to listen to Me, then I shall smite you even more, seven-fold according to your sins.
- 26:22 And I will send against you the beast of the field, and it will despoil you; and it will cut off your cattle and diminish you, and your ways will be made desolate.
- 26:23 And if with these you will not be chastised unto Me, but walk with Me in laxity,

And if with these [be'eileh] - Because of the sins of false oaths and vain oaths, and desecration of the Name, and desecration of the Sabbath, wild beasts multiply, domestic animals die out, men grow few in number, and the roads become desolate, as it is written: "And if be'eileh you will not be chastised unto Me." Read it not "be'eileh," but "be'alah" ["because of the oath"]. And it is written: "And I will send against you the beast of the field, etc." And in respect to false oaths it is written (Leviticus 19:12): "And you shall not swear in My name falsely,

that you not desecrate the name of your G-d"; and, in respect to desecration of the Name (Ibid. 22:33); "And you shall not desecrate My holy name"; and, in respect to the Sabbath (Exodus 31:14): "Those who desecrate it shall be put to death." And we derive [the above cause and effect relationship by way of] "desecration" [stated in respect to the others] - "desecration," stated in respect to false oaths ["alah"] (Shabbath 33a).³³

- 26:24 And I, too, shall walk with you "in laxity," and I, too, shall smite you, seven-fold for your sins.
- 26:25 And I will bring upon you a sword, avenging the vengeance of the covenant. And you will be gathered together into your cities, and I will send a plague in your midst, and you will be delivered into the hand of the foe.

a sword, avenging - From here it is derived that wherever "vengeance" is mentioned, the "sword" is the instrument; hence, the halachah that a murderer [in respect to whom it is written (Exodus 21:20): "Vengeance shall be taken"] is executed by the sword (Sanhedrin 52b).³⁴

the vengeance of the covenant - Because of delay of judgement, and perversion of judgment, and abuse of judgment, and neglect of Torah study, there come: the sword, and great spoil, and plague, and famine; and people eat and are not sated, and they eat their bread by weight, as it is written: "And I will bring upon you a sword, avenging the vengeance of the covenant." And "the covenant" is none other than that of Torah, as it is written (*Jeremiah* 33:25): "If not for My covenant day and night" [i.e., the Torah, of which it is written (*Joshua* 1:8): "And you shall study it day and night")] This followed by (26): "When I break your staff of bread, ten women will bake...(46) because My judgments they despised" (*Shabbath* 33a). 35,36

26:26 When I break your staff of bread, ten women will bake your bread in one oven, and they shall deliver your bread by weight and you will eat and not be sated.

- 26:27 And if with this you do not hearken to Me, but walk with Me in laxity,
- 26:28 Then I will walk with you in "the fury of laxity," and I, too, will chastise you, seven-fold for your sins.
- 26:29 And you will eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters will you eat.
- 26:30 And I will destroy your high places, and I will cut down your sun-pillars, and I will cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols, and My soul shall abhor you.

and I will cast your carcasses - It was taught: Because of the sin of idolatry, exile comes into the world. The Jews are exiled, and others come and sit in their place, as it is written: "And I will cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols," followed by: "and I will make desolate your sanctuaries...and you will I scatter among the nations" (Ibid.).³⁷

upon the carcasses of your idols - It was taught: At the destruction of Jerusalem] Elijah made the rounds of those stricken with hunger. Once, coming upon a child cast upon a dung-hill, swollen with hunger, he asked him: "From which family are you?" The child answered: "From such and such." Elijah: "Is anyone left of that family?" The child: "No one, except me." Elijah: "If I teach you something that will keep you alive, will you learn it?" The child: "Yes." Elijah: "Say every day: 'Hear O Israel, the L-rd our G-d, the L-rd is one.'" The child: "Hush!" (i.e., Do not mention the name of G-d — which had never been taught him by his father and mother.) Saying this, the child took his idol from his bosom, embraced and kissed it, his innards burst, the idol fell upon the earth, and the child fell upon the idol, bringing to pass: "and I will cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols" (Sanhedrin 64a).

26:31 And I will lay waste your cities, and I will make desolate your sanctuaries, and I will not smell your sweet savors.

496

and I will make desolate your sanctuaries - R. Yehudah said: In a ruined synagogue, no eulogies are made, no ropes are tied, no nets are spread, no fruits are spread on its roof, and no short-cuts are made through it, it being written: "and I will make desolate your sanctuaries" - Though desolate, they retain their sanctity (Megillah 28a). 39-41

and I will make desolate your sanctuaries [mikdesheichem] -"sanctuary, "My sanctuary," "your sanctuaries" [all of these being implicit in the word in the Hebrew] - to include [along with the Temples | houses of worship and houses of study (Torath Cohanim).42

- 26:32 And I will make desolate the land, and your foes who dwell therein will be awe-struck thereby.
- 26:33 And you will I scatter among the nations, and I will draw out the sword after you, and your land will be desolate, and your cities will be waste.
- 26:34 Then shall the land requite its Sabbaths, all of the days of its desolation — and you in the land of your foes! Then shall the land rest and it shall requite its Sabbaths.

Then shall the land requite its Sabbaths, etc. - It was taught: Because of the sin of [non-observance of] Sabbatical and Jubilee years, exile comes into the world. The Jews are exiled, and others come and sit in their place, as it is written: "Then shall the land requite its Sabbaths, all the days of its desolation - and you in the land of your foes!" And (35): "All the days of its desolation shall it rest" (Shabbath 33a).43

- 26:35 All the days of its desolation shall it rest what it did not rest in your Sabbatical years when you dwelt upon it.
- 26:36 And those who are left of you I will bring terror into their hearts in the lands of their foes, and they will be

chased by the sound of a driven leaf, and they will flee as one flees the sword, and they will fall though none pursue.

26:37 And they will stumble, one man by his brother, as before the sword, though none pursue; and you will not arise before your foes.

And they will stumble, one man by his brother — "one man by his brother" — one man because of the sin of his brother — whereby we are taught that they are all responsible for one another (Sanhedrin 27b).⁴⁴

26:38 And you will go lost among the nations, and you will be devoured by the land of your foes.

And you will go lost among the nations - It was taught: R. Yossi b. R. Chanina said: Moses our teacher pronounced a decree upon the Jews: "And you will go lost among the nations." Isaiah came and nullified it, as it is written (*Isaiah* 27:13): "And there will come those who were lost in the land of Ashur and those who were cast out in the land of Egypt, and they will bow down to the L-rd in the holy mountain, in Jerusalem" (*Makkoth* 24a). 45

And you will go lost among the nations - Rav said: I am afraid of that verse: "And you will go lost among the nations," [whereupon] R. Pappa asked: Perhaps [the connotation is:] as an object that is lost and avidly sought after! But the verse continues: "and you will be devoured by the land of your foes"! [whereupon] Mar Zutra asked: Perhaps, as cucumbers and gourds are devoured [i.e., only the shell being sloughed off]! (Ibid.). 46,47

And you will go lost among the nations - It was taught: R. Akiva says: "And you will go lost among the nations" — these are the ten tribes that were exiled to Medea. Others say that by "lost," "exiled" is meant (Torath Cohanim).⁴⁸

26:39 And those that are left of you will melt away in their sins

498

in the lands of your enemies; and also with the sins of their fathers with them will they melt away.

and also with the sins of their fathers with them will they melt away -When? When they hold on to the deeds of their fathers. But perhaps [this applies] even when they do not hold onto them! [Do not entertain this notion, for] (Deuteronomy 24:16): "A man shall die for his own sin" indicates our verse to be speaking of those who hold on to the sins of their fathers (Sanhedrin 27b).49

- 26:40 And they will confess their sins and the sin of their fathers. their faithlessness wherein they betraved Me, and their having walked with Me in laxity.
- 26:41 That I, too, walked with them "in laxity" and brought them into the land of their foes — if then their uncircumcised heart be humbled and then their sin be expiated,
- 26:42 Then I shall remember My covenant with Jacob, and also My covenant with Isaac, and also My covenant with Abraham will I remember; and the land will I remember.

Then I shall remember My covenant, etc. - R. Simon said: If the fathers of the world [i.e., the patriarchs] sought to take the reward of the mitzvoth which they did in this world, whence would merit obtain for their children after them? This is what underlies Moses' saying to the Jews: "Then I shall remember My covenant, with Jacob, etc." (Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10:1).50

Then I shall remember My covenant [eth berithi] - This tells me only of the patriarchs. Whence do I derive [the same learning for] the matriarchs? From: "eth." "eth" alluding to the matriarchs, as it is written (Genesis 49:31): "There they buried Abraham ve'eth Sarah, his wife" (Torath Cohanim).51

My covenant with Jacob - It was taught: Why are the patriarchs

mentioned in reverse order? [To teach that] in the absence of the deeds of Abraham, the deeds of Isaac would suffice; in the absence of the deeds of Isaac, the deeds of Jacob would suffice. Each is worthy of saving the world in his own merit (*Ibid.*).52,53

My covenant with Jacob - It was taught: Why are Abraham and Isaac qualified by "also," but not Jacob? To teach us that the bed of Jacob our father was perfect [i.e., no unworthy progeny issued from him] (*Ibid.*).54,55

My covenant with Isaac - Why is "remembering" stated in respect to Abraham and Jacob, but not in respect to Isaac? Because G-d [more than "remembering," constantly] sees his ashes as heaped upon the altar [which he ascended as a willing sacrifice] (*Ibid.*).⁵⁶

and the land will I remember - It was taught: Whence is it derived that a covenant has been made with the land? From: "and the land will I remember" [as I remember the covenants with the patriarchs] (Ibid.).57

- 26:43 And the land will be abandoned of them, and it will requite its Sabbaths in being desolate of them. And they will requite their sins for the certain cause that they despised My judgments and My statutes were abhorred by their souls.
- 26:44 And notwithstanding all this, when they were in the land of their foes, I did not despise them and I did not abhor them to destroy them, to break My covenant with them; for I am the L-rd their G-d.

I did not despise them, etc. - Shmuel said: "I did not despise them"—in the days of the Greeks; "and I did not abhor them"—in the days of Nebuchadnezzar; "to destroy them"—in the days of Haman; "to break My covenant with them"—in the days of the Persians; "for I am the L-rd their G-d"—in the days of Gog and Magog (Megillah 11a).58

I did not despise them, etc. - It was taught: "I did not despise them" — in the days of the Kasdim, when I raised up for them Daniel,

Chananiah, Mishael, and Azariah; "and I did not abhor them" — in the days of the Greeks, when I raised up for them Shimon Hatzadik and the Hasmoneans and their sons and Matithyahu the high priest; "to destroy them" — in the days of Haman, when I raised up for them Mordecai and Esther; "to break My covenant with them" — in the days of the Persians, when I raised up for them the house of Rebbi and the sage: of the generations; "for I am the L-rd their G-d" — in time to come, when no nation or tongue will be able to rule over them (Ibid.). 59

- 26:45 And I will remember for them the covenant with their ancestors, whom I took out of the land of Egypt before the eyes of the nations to be a G-d to them. I am the L-rd.
- 26:46 These are the statutes and the judgments and the teachings which the L-rd set forth between Himself and the children of Israel, on Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.

These are the statutes, etc. - It was taught: "the statutes" — these are the *midrashim*; "and the judgments" — these are the laws; "and the teachings" — This teaches us that two Torahs were given to Israel, one written, and one, oral; "on Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses" — This teaches us that the entire Torah — its *halachoth*, inferences, and interpretations — was given by Moses at Sinai (*Torath Cohanim*).60

- 27:1 And the L-rd said to Moses, saying:
- 27:2 Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: A man if he utter a vow in your valuation of souls to the L-rd,

Speak to the children of Israel - It was taught: The children of Israel assess, but gentiles do not assess. I might, then, think that they also are not assessed; it is, therefore, written: "A man." These are the words of R. Meir (Erchin 5b).

and say to them - to include converts and servants (Torath Cohanim).2

A man - This tells me only of a man. Whence do I derive the same for a woman? From: "in your valuation of souls" (Erchin 5b).³

a man if he utter - What is the intent of "if he utter"? To include the utterance of one who is close to the stage of manhood as effecting consecration (*Temurah* 2b).⁴

a vow in your valuation - Consecration is likened to valuation. Just as in valuation an "arrangement" is made for him [i.e., If he dedicates his own value to the Temple, it is arranged that he be left with enough for his personal necessities], so in consecration [i.e., if he consecrates a certain sum to the Temple], an "arrangement" is made. And just as in valuation he is assessed by his life [i.e., If he dedicates the value of a vital organ, he pays his entire value], so in consecration, he is assessed by his life (Bava Metzia 114b). 5,6

a vow in your valuation - Valuation is likened to vows. Just as with vows, one is liable to transgression of (*Deuteronomy* 23:22): "Do not delay to pay it," so with valuation, one is liable to transgression of "Do not delay" (*Torath Cohanim*).

a vow in your valuation of souls - It was taught: If one says: I dedicate the value of half of me, he gives his entire value. Why so? For it is written: "a vow in your valuation of souls" [his entire "soul" being dependent upon half of him] (Erchin 20a).8

in your valuation of souls - to include an unspecified valuation. What is an unspecified valuation? As we learned: One who says: "I take upon myself a valuation" gives the least of valuations. And what is the least of valuations? Three shekels (*1bid.* 4b).^{9,10}

in your valuation of souls - "in your valuation" — He gives his entire value and not the value of individual limbs. I might think that I, therefore, exclude [as effecting consecration, even dedication of] an organ that one's life is dependent upon; it is, therefore, written: "souls" [If he dedicates such an organ, he pays the value of his entire "soul"] (*Ibid.*).^{11,12}

in your valuation of souls - "souls" — to exclude [valuation of] one who is dead (*Ibid.*).¹³

in your valuation of souls - I would know [that the valuation takes effect] only if one pronounced the formula of valuation for *one*. Whence would I derive [that one pronouncement can be used by] one, even for one hundred? From: "souls" (*Ibid.*).¹⁴

in your valuation of souls - "souls" — to include one who is disfigured or afflicted with boils. I might think that "a vow in your valuation" implies that all whose [bodies have] monetary value are subject to the laws of valuation, and all who do not have such value are not subject to these laws; it is, therefore, written: "souls" (*Ibid.*). 15

in your valuation of souls - One who says: I consecrate the value of my head or of my liver pays his entire value. Why so? For it is written: "in your valuation of souls" [and the entire "soul" is dependent upon these] (*Ibid.* 20a). 16

27:3 Then your valuation shall be, for the male, from twenty years until sixty years — Then your valuation shall be fifty shekels of silver in the shekel of the sanctuary.

Then your valuation shall be for the male - a male and not a tumtum [one whose sex is in doubt] or a hermaphrodite. I might think that he is not valuated as a man, but that he is valuated as a woman; it is, therefore, written (4): "And if she be a female" — a definite male or a definite female, and not a tumtum or a hermaphrodite (Ibid. 4b).¹⁷

then your valuation shall be - [Why repeat "then your valuation shall be"?] to include a tumtum and a hermaphrodite in the monetary realm [i.e., They are not included in the province of valuations, but they are included in that of vows]. For I might think that "a vow in your valuation" implies that all who are in the province of valuation are in that of money [i.e., vows], and all who are not in the province of valuation are not in the province of money; it is, therefore, repeated: "Then your valuation shall be" [i.e., It is only from this realm that the tumtum and hermaphrodite are excluded] (Ibid.). 18,19

then your valuation shall be fifty shekels - This teaches us that in valuations the maximum is fifty sela (Ibid. 7b).²⁰

- 27:4 And if she be a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekel.
- 27:5 And if from five years until twenty years, then your valuation shall be: for the male, twenty shekels; and for the female, ten shekels.

And if from five years, etc. - The fifth year and the twentieth year are reckoned [for purposes of valuation] as [the years] below them. Why so? It is written here "year," and, in respect to a sixty-year'old, "year" (7). Just as there, the sixtieth year itself is reckoned as those below it [it being written: "And if from (i.e., from the end of) sixty years and above"], so the fifth and the twentieth years are reckoned as those below them, whether for attenuation or stringency (*Ibid.* 18a). 21-23

- 27:6 And if from one month until five years, then your valuation shall be: for the male, five shekels of silver; and your valuation for the female, three shekels of silver.
- 27:7 And if from sixty years and above: if a male, then your valuation shall be fifteen shekels; and if a female, ten shekels.
- 27:8 And if he be too poor from your valuation, then he shall be stood before the priest, and the priest shall valuate him; according to the attainment of the hand of the vower shall the priest valuate him.

And if he be too poor from your valuation - It was taught: Though it was taught that securities are taken from those owing valuations, they are left with enough food for thirty days, clothing for twelve months, a spread bed, shoes, and phylacteries. Whence is this derived? From: "And if he be too poor from your valuation" — Maintain him from your valuation. But this is not done for his wife and his children.

Whence is this derived? "he from your valuation," and not his wife and children from your valuation (Ibid. 24a). 24.25

then he shall be stood, etc. - "then he shall be stood" — to exclude one [in this instance, the object of the valuation,] who was on his deathbed, it being written: "then he shall be stood... and the priest shall valuate" — All who are capable of standing are subject to valuation, and all who are not, are not subject to valuation (*Ibid.* 4b).²⁶

then he shall be stood before the priest - Consecrated property is assessed by three judges; valuations of movables, by three; valuations of land, by nine and one priest; and the same [nine and one priest] applies for valuations of human beings. Whence is this derived? Shmuel said: Ten "priests" are written in the section [on valuations], one for itself [i.e., for the necessity of at least one priest], and the others for [purposes of] exclusion [i.e., a priest, and not an Israelite]; and, the rule being that the effect of exclusion upon exclusion is to include, the net result is that even nine Israelites and one priest may preside (Sanhedrin 15a). 27,28

according to the attainment of the hand, etc. - If he were poor [at the time of the vow] and became rich [before the time of payment], or if he were rich and became poor, he gives according to the valuation of a rich man. Why so? For it is written: "according to the attainment of the hand of the vower" [In the first instance, his hand "attains"; in the second, "the vower" was rich] (Erchin 17b).²⁹

according to the attainment of the hand of the vower - This teaches us that Scripture [in the instance of a poor vower] makes the valuation contingent upon the vower, and not upon the object of the vow (*Ibid.* a).³⁰

shall the priest valuate him - It was taught: I might think that if he said: "The value of that man is upon me [to pay]," and the man died, he is not liable; it is, therefore, written: "shall the priest valuate him"—even if he died (*Torath Cohanim*).³¹

27:9 And if it be a beast, of which men present an offering to the L-rd, all that he gives of it to the L-rd shall be holy.

an offering to the L-rd - The Rabbis taught: I might think that animals consecrated for Temple maintenance are susceptible of substitution; it is, therefore, written: "an offering" — Only what is called "an offering" [is thus susceptible], to exclude animals consecrated for Temple maintenance, which are not called "offerings" (Temurah 13a). 32, 33

of it to the L-rd shall be holy - The Rabbis taught: I might think that if one said: "The leg of this animal is a burnt-offering," the entire animal becomes a burnt-offering; it is, therefore, written: "all that he gives of it to the L-rd shall be holy" — "of it to the L-rd," and not all of it to the L-rd. [If so,] I would think that the animal takes on non-sacred status; it is, therefore, written: "shall be holy." How is this to be reconciled? He sells it for purposes of burnt-offerings and the money he receives is non-sacred except for the amount of the particular limb [which he consecrated] (Ibid. 11b). 34-36

27:10 He shall not exchange it and he shall not substitute for it, good by bad or bad by good. And if he substitutes, substitutes, beast for beast, then it and its substitute shall be holy.

He shall not exchange it, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "He shall not exchange it" for another's; "and he shall not substitute it" for his own (*Ibid.* 9a).³⁷

He shall not exchange it, etc. - The populace [collectively] and partners cannot make substitutes, it being written: "He shall not exchange it and he shall not substitute for it" — an individual can make a substitute, but the populace and partners cannot make substitutes (Ibid. 13a).³⁸

and he shall not substitute [yamir] for it - It was taught: "Temurah" is "exchange," and thus it is written: "He shall not exchange it, velo yamir otho" (Bava Metzia 47a). 39

and he shall not substitute for it - It was taught: The consecrated beasts of gentiles are not susceptible of substitution, it being written: "He shall not exchange it and he shall not substitute for it"; and the

section is prefaced by (2): "Speak to the children of *Israel*" (*Temurah* 3a).40

and he shall not substitute for it - If one says: "This animal is in place of a [instead of "this"] sin-offering," or "in place of a burnt-offering," he has said nothing, it being written: "He shall not exchange it and he shall not substitute for it" — The consecrated animal must be distinctly recognized as such when the substitution is made (Rav Ovadiah Bartenura on Temurah 5:6).41

good by bad - What is "good by bad"? Blemished animals whose consecration preceded their blemish. This teaches us that substitution is effected from blemished animals to perfect ones, and from perfect animals to blemished ones (*Temurah* 9a).⁴²

good by bad - If bad is not to be substituted for by good, then certainly good is not to be substituted for by bad. Why mention, then, "good by bad"? [To teach us that] what is good [i.e., perfect] from the beginning [i.e., when it is consecrated] can effect substitution, and what is bad [i.e., blemished from the beginning] cannot effect substitution. From here it is derived that consecrated animals whose consecration was preceded by a fixed blemish and which were subsequently redeemed are not susceptible of substitution (Bechoroth 14b).⁴³

And if he substitutes, substitutes - "And if" — to include women in [the institution of] substitution ["And if" having a connotation of extension in the Hebrew]; "substitutes, substitutes" — to include the heir [as effecting substitution] (Temurah 2a,b).^{44,45}

substitutes beast - Birds and meal-offerings are not susceptible of substitution, only "beast" being written (*Ibid.* 13a).⁴⁶

beast for beast - From here [i.e., from the fact that the generic "beast" is used], it is derived that substitution can take effect from sheep to cattle, from cattle to sheep, from lambs to goats, from goats to lambs, from males to females, from females to males (*Ibid.* 9a).⁴⁷

beast for beast - This teaches us that substitution is effected from one [non-sacred animal] to two [sacred ones], from two [sacred] to one [non-sacred], from one to one hundred, from one hundred to one (*Ibid.*).⁴⁸

beast for beast - And not beast for fetuses, and not fetuses for a beast; not fetuses for limbs, and not limbs for fetuses; not whole animals for limbs, and not limbs for whole animals (*Torath Cohanim*).^{49,50}

then it and its substitute - If one slaughters a Paschal Lamb as a substitute, it is not consecrated. Why so? For it is written: "then it and its substitute shall be holy" — this one [i.e., the one he originally designated as such] is a substitute, and another [as in the above case] is not a substitute (Zevachim 9a).⁵¹

then it and its substitute - Priests cannot effect substitution for a first-born animal [of a Jew, which was given to them], it being written: "then it and its substitute shall be holy." Where is it [the first-born animal] invested with holiness? In the house of the owner [where it is born]; substitution also, then, can be effected only in the house of the owner (Temurah 7b).⁵²

then it and its substitute - even a hundred [i.e., Even if he made a hundred substitutions for it, he incurs the penalty of stripes for each substitution] (*Ibid.* 9a).⁵³

then it and its substitute - One substitute cannot effect another, and the offspring [of a consecrated animal] cannot effect substitution, it being written: "then it and its substitute" — "it," and not its offspring; "and its substitute," and not the substitute of its substitute (*Ibid.* 13a). 54

shall be holy - to include unwitting as deliberate [substitution]. What is "unwitting substitution"? R. Yochanan and Resh Lakish both say: Thinking to say: [Let this animal be] a substitute for a burnt-offering, and saying: [Let it be a substitute for] a peace-offering (*Ibid.* 17a).55

27:11 And if any unclean beast, which may not be presented of it as an offering to the L-rd, then the beast shall be stood before the priest.

And if any unclean beast - Scripture speaks of the redemption of consecrated animals which became blemished. But perhaps it speaks of literally "unclean" animals! [This cannot be, for in the verse] (27): "And if of the unclean beast, then you shall redeem it with your

valuation," literally "unclean" beasts are referred to. How, then, are we to understand: "And if any unclean beast, etc."? As referring to the redemption of blemished animals (*Ibid.* 32b).^{56,57}

unclean beast - to include one [i.e., a consecrated animal] that has died (Torath Cohanim). 58

which may not be presented of it - It was taught: I might think that it must be redeemed even if it contracted a passing blemish; it is, therefore, written: "which may not be presented of it" — which may not be presented at all, to exclude one which may not be presented today, but may be presented tomorrow [when the blemish passes] (Temurah 33a).⁵⁹

then the beast shall be stood - Birds, wood, frankincense, and serving vessels which became defiled cannot be redeemed, "redemption" being stated only with respect to beasts (Menachoth 100b).^{60,61}

27:12 And the priest shall valuate it, whether good or bad; as the priest valuates it for you, so shall it be.

whether good or bad - This teaches us that consecrated animals are not redeemed by approximation [but there must be an exact estimate] (Torath Cohanim).⁶²

so shall it be - If one said: I will take it for ten selaim; another: for twenty; another: for thirty; another: for forty; another: for fifty — If the "fifty" backed out, his property is attached for ten selaim; if the "forty," his property is attached for ten; if the "thirty," his property, for ten; if the "twenty," his property, for ten; if the "ten," the animal is sold for its [market] worth, and the balance is made up by the "ten" (Erchin 27a).63

27:13 And if he would redeem, redeem it, then he shall add its fifth to your valuation.

And if he would redeem, redeem it - to include one's wife and his heir [in this halachah] (Torath Cohanim).64

then he shall add its fifth - This is stated in respect to the owners [who come to redeem it, and not in respect to others, who come to purchase it] (Ibid.).65

27:14 And a man, if he consecrate his house, holy to the L-rd, then the priest shall valuate it, whether good or bad; as the priest shall valuate it, so shall it stand.

And a man, if he consecrate his house, etc. - What are we speaking of? If of his living quarters, it is already written (15): "And if the consecrator would redeem his house"! We must be speaking, then, of one who consecrates his possessions — from which we derive that consecrations in general go towards Temple maintenance [i.e., The value of the property is assessed and the monies go towards Temple maintenance] (Yerushalmi Shekalim 4:4).66

if he consecrate his house - as his house; just as his house is his, so all that is his. From here it is derived that a man cannot consecrate something which is not his [i.e., the substance of which does not belong to him, e.g., his children] (Bava Kamma 68b).⁶⁷

if he consecrate his house - as his house; just as his house is in his possession, so all that is in his possession. From here it is derived that a man cannot consecrate something which is not in his possession (*Ibid.* 69b).⁶⁸

27:15 And if the consecrator would redeem his house, then he shall add a fifth of the money of your valuation upon it, and it shall be his.

And if the consecrator would redeem - It was taught: R. Yehoshua b. Levi said: For first consecrations [i.e., the objects originally consecrated] one adds a fifth [to redeem them]; and for second consecrations [i.e., the objects onto which the original consecration was transfered], a fifth is not added. Whence is this derived? From: "And if the consecrator would redeem his house" — the [original] consecrator and not the transferer (Baya Metzia 54b).69

And if the consecrator would redeem - This teaches us that the consecrator adds the fifth, and not the one it atones for [if the latter wishes to redeem a blemished animal that the first consecrated for him] (Temurah 10a).70

then he shall add a fifth of the money of your valuation - The fifth is likened to the money of its valuation; just as a fifth is added to the money of its valuation, so a fifth is added to the fifth [if he derives benefit from the latter] (*Ibid.* 11a).⁷¹

then he shall add...and it shall be his - If he redeemed it from the Temple for one hundred, and had not yet brought the hundred when it rose to two hundred, then he brings two hundred, it being written: "then he shall add a fifth of the money of your valuation upon it, and it shall be his" — if he adds, it is his; if not, it is not his (Yerushalmi Kiddushin 1:6).⁷²

27:16 And if from the field of his holding shall a man consecrate to the L-rd, then your valuation shall be according to its sowing; the sowing of a *chomer* of barley for fifty silver shekels.

And if from the field of his holding - This tells me only of a field of holding from his father. Whence do I derive the same halachah for such a field from his mother? From: "shall a man consecrate" — in any event (Torath Cohanim).⁷³

according to its sowing - according to its sowing [i.e., the amount sown], and not according to its produce (*Ibid.*).⁷⁴

the sowing of a chomer of barley - Both he who consecrates in the sands of Machoz and he who consecrates in the orchards of Sebaste gives the sowing of a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels (*Erchin* 14a).⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷

the sowing of a chomer of barley - This tells me only of a field of seed. Whence do I derive [the same halachah] for a field of grapevines and a field of trees? From: "field" — any kind (Ibid.). 78

the sowing of a chomer of barley - R. Pappa said: If he consecrated trees, they must be redeemed at their value [and not by the "chomer"

standard]. Why so? Scripture speaks of a *field* of seed, and not of [individual] trees (*Ibid.* b).^{79,80}

the sowing of a chomer of barley - R. Pappa said: If he consecrated rocky ground, it is redeemed at its own value. Why so? Scripture speaks of a field of *seed* [with respect to the "chomer" standard], and such ground cannot be sown (*Ibid.*).81,82

the sowing of a chomer of barley - It was taught: [The standard is: the amount of land required for the sowing of] a kur of seed, and not [the amount required for the growing of] a kur of grain; hand-sowing [where the seed falls over a greater area], and not ox-sowing [where the same amount of seed, falling from a perforated bag on the ox, falls over a smaller area]. Levi taught: [The standard is] not thick-seeding [such a standard resulting in a loss for the redeemer (i.e., the thicker the seeding with the same amount of seed, the smaller the area)], and not thinseeding [which would result in a loss for the Temple], but medium-seeding (Ibid. 25a). 83-85

27:17 If from the Jubilee year he shall consecrate his field, according to your valuation shall it stand.

he shall consecrate his field - What is the intent of "his field"? To teach that if there were in its clefts ten *tefachim* deep or rocks ten *tefachim* high, they are not measured along with the field [since they cannot be sown] (*Torath Cohanim*).^{86,87}

according to your valuation shall it stand - The Rabbis taught: Money commitments [i.e., "I consecrate the money-worth of that object"] were likened to valuations [i.e., "I consecrate my valuation"] in respect to not waiting for better prices on jewelry [but assessing on the basis of the "here and now"] and in respect to equating a life-linked organ with the entire animal. I might, therefore, think that valuations are to be likened to money commitments in that he gives according to [the value at] the time of giving; it is, therefore, written: "according to your valuation shall it stand" — He gives only according to [the value at] the time of valuation (Erchin 18a). 88-91

according to your valuation shall it stand - How much does he give?

Forty-nine selaim and forty-nine pondionoth. And what is the nature [i.e., the purpose] of this pondion? It is the premium [for exchange of currency] (Torath Cohanim).⁹²

27:18 And if after the Jubilee year he shall consecrate his field, then the priest shall reckon for him the money according to the years remaining until the Jubilee year, and it shall be deducted from your valuation.

And if after the Jubilee year - If one consecrates his field in the Jubilee year itself, Shmuel says: It is not consecrated at all. How, then, are we to understand: "And if after the Jubilee year" [which would seem to imply that the preceding verse: "if from the Jubilee year" speaks of consecrating a field in the Jubilee year itself!] As: "after, after" [i.e., "If from" signifies the year after, and "If after," the year after that] (Erchin 24b). 93,94

the money - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if the owners say: We would like to pay in yearly instalments, they are not heeded? From: "then the priest shall reckon for him the money" — all of the money must be forthcoming at one time (Ibid. 25a).95

according to the years - It was taught: Months are not reckoned for consecrated land, it being written: "then he shall reckon for him according to the years remaining" — years are reckoned, and not months. And whence is it derived that if you [the priest] wish to reckon the months of the year, you may do so? From: "then the priest shall reckon for him" — in any manner (*Ibid.*).96,97

according to the years - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one should not [i.e., that it is not advisable to] consecrate [his field] less than two years before the Jubilee year, and that it is not redeemed [i.e., There is no need to redeem it because his consecration does not take effect] less than one year after [the beginning of] the Jubilee year? From: "then the priest shall reckon for him the money according to the years remaining" [since "years," signifies at least two, if he consecrates less than two years before, since the reckoning cannot be made, he must pay the entire fifty-year sum to redemem it! And, as to the latter instance, it is in accordance with Shmuel, who rules (see 94 above) that

there is no consecration in the Jubilee year itself] (Torath Cohanim).98

until the Jubilee year - It is not to enter into the Jubilee year at all [That is, "until," and not including] (Ibid.).99

and it shall be deducted [venigra] from your valuation - From here we deduce that in the halachah, foods combine with each other [in the formation of halachic quanitites] with the exception of their shells and their kernels ["garineihen"], and the word "garineihen," is to be spelled with an ayin and not with an aleph [coming, as it apparently does, from the same root as "venigra" (also spelled with an ayin), the idea of deduction and of casting away (the kernel) being essentially the same] (Shabbath 77b). 100

and it shall be deducted from your valuation - The Rabbis taught: "and it shall be deducted from your valuation" — even from [the time itself that it was] consecrated; so that whether or not the field was cultivated by the Temple functionaries, but was simply in the Temple domain, he gives a *sela* and a *pondion* for each year [from the redemption until the Jubilee year] (*Erchin* 25a). 101

27:19 And if redeem, will redeem the field, he who consecrates it, then he shall add one fifth of the money of your valuation upon it, and it shall be his.

And if redeem, will redeem - This teaches us that [with consecrated fields, unlike unconsecrated fields, when the Jubilee is in force], he may borrow [money] to redeem [a field that he had consecrated], and he may redeem [a consecrated field] by halves (*Ibid.* 30b). 102

And if redeem, will redeem - to include one's wife and his heir [in this halachah] (Torath Cohanim). 103

the field - What is the intent of "the field"? Because it is written (16): "the sowing of a *chomer* of barley for fifty silver shekels," I might think that this applies only if he consecrated a field big enough for such a measure. Whence would I derive [the same *proportion* for smaller fields, such as those the size of] a *letech*, half a *letech*, a sa'ah, a tarkav, and half a tarkav? It is, therefore, written: "a field" — of any size (Erchin 25a). 104-106

the money of your valuation - Consecrated property and ma'aser sheni are not redeemed by notes of indebtedness, it being written: "And he shall give the money" [so, the "thrust," (though not exactly the language,) of our verse], "and it shall be his" (Kiddushin 5a). 107

the money [lit., "silver"] of your valuation - R. Yehudah said in the name of R. Assi: All "silver" mentioned in the Torah is the silver [coin] of Tyre. But is it not written in respect to [the redemption of] consecrated land: "And he shall give the silver and it shall be his," concerning which Shmuel said: Consecrated property worth a manah which was redeemed by the worth of a perutah [a coin of minimal value] is redeemed [which shows that the "silver" in our verse is not to be taken literally, but generically (i.e., "money")]! This [does not constitute a contradiction, for it] is derived: "silver" [here] - "silver," in respect to ma'aser [where the worth of a perutah is demonstrated to be sufficient, but, in the absence of such specific derivations, R. Yehudah's rule (above) stands] (Ibid. 11b). 108-110

the money of your valuation upon it - Rami b. Chama said: We learned that consecrated property cannot be redeemed by land, it being written: "And he shall give the *money* and it shall be his." But may the one-fifth be redeemed by land? Rava answered [that it may not, for] it is written: "upon it," to include the fifth as being like it [the consecrated property] (Bava Metzia 54a).¹¹¹

and it shall be his - It was taught: If one ate consecrated food which was not redeemed, he does not recite grace over it. Is this not obvious? No it is not [for the instance referred to is one in which the food was redeemed, but not correctly. How so?] It was redeemed by land and not by money, and Scripture states: "And he shall give the *money* and it shall be his" (*Berachoth* 47b).¹¹²

and it shall be his - It was taught: Consecrated food which was not redeemed is not cleared away for guests on the Sabbath [i.e., Since it may not be eaten, it is muktzeh]. Is this not obvious? No it is not, for the instance referred to is one in which the food was redeemed, but not correctly, being redeemed by land, whereas Scripture states: "And he shall give the money and it shall be his" (Shabbath 128a). 113,114

and it shall be his - An eruy is not made with consecrated food which

was not redeemed [since an *eruv* requires food which can be eaten]. Is this not obvious? No it is not, for the instance referred to is one in which the food was redeemed, but not correctly, being redeemed by land, whereas Scripture states: "And he shall give the *money* and it shall be his" (*Eruvin* 31b). 115

and it shall be his - It was taught: One does not fulfill his Pesach obligation [of matzoh] with consecrated food which was not redeemed. Is this not obvious? No it is not, for the instance referred to is one in which the food was redeemed, but not correctly, being redeemed by land, whereas Scripture states: "And he shall give the *money* and it shall be his" (*Pesachim* 35b). 116

27:20 And if he does not redeem the field, and if he sells the field to another man, it shall not be redeemed again.

And if he does not redeem, etc. - The Rabbis taught: "And if he does not redeem" — the owner: "and if he sells" — the [Temple] treasurer (Erchin 25b). 117

to another man - "to another man," and not to the son. But perhaps [the meaning is "to another man"] and not to the brother! This cannot be, for his brother is already subsumed in the word "man." How are we to understand the word "another"? [As to another man] and not to his son [who is regarded as an extension of his father] (*Ibid.*).¹¹⁸

it shall not be redeemed again - I might think that he cannot even redeem it as a "field of acquisition" [which returns to the Temple on the Jubilee year (as opposed to a "field of holding" [a patrimony]) which returns to him on the Jubilee year]; it is, therefore, written: "again," i.e., it does not revert to its prior status [a field of holding], but he may redeem it as a field of acquisition (Ibid. 26a). 119,120

27:21 And the field shall be, when it goes out on the Jubilee year, holy to the L-rd, as a devoted field; to the priest shall be his holding.

And the field shall be - R. Pappa said: If one consecrated rocky ground

and did not redeem it, it goes out on the Jubilee year; but if he consecrated trees and did not redeem them, they do not go out on the Jubilee year. Why so? Scripture writes: "the field," and not "trees" (*Ibid.* 14b). 121, 122

And the field shall be, etc. - Rami b. Chamma asked R. Chisda: If he consecrated the field less than two years before the Jubilee year [and another redeemed it for the full fifty shekels and not by deduction (see commentary 98)], does it revert to the priests on the Jubilee year [or does the Jubilee reversion follow only deduction, as it does in the order of the verses]? He answered: It is written: "And if he does not redeem... the field shall be, when it goes out on the Jubilee year"; and this, too, [i.e., the field of the above query,] was subject to redemption (*Ibid.* 25b). 123

And the field - R. Shimon b. Yochai says: The laws of "devoted fields" apply only when the Jubilee is in force, it being written: "And the field shall be when it goes out on the Jubilee year, holy to the L-rd, as a devoted field" (*Ibid.* 29a). 124

holy to the L-rd - It was taught: If the Jubilee year arrived and the field had not been redeemed, the priests take possession of it and pay its price [according to the "chomer" standard (see 16)]. These are the words of R. Yehudah. Whence is this derived? From: "holy" [here]- "holy," in respect to the consecration of one's house. Just as there [the priests can acquire it only] by payment [of the priest's valuation]; here, too, by payment [and not gratis] (*Ibid.* 25b). 125,126

as a devoted field - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that a priest who consecrated his devoted field [i.e., a field "devoted" by an Israelite that had fallen to him] should not say: Since consecrated fields go out to the priests on the Jubilee year, and this is already in my hands, let it remain with me! What is more, it follows a fortiori, viz.: If I gain what belongs to others [i.e., "devoted fields"], should I not retain my own! [To obviate this] it is written: "And the field shall be... as a devoted field." Now what do we learn from [this comparison to] a devoted field? "It ["a devoted field"] comes to 'teach' and ends up 'learning'." A devoted field is being likened to a field of holding of an Israelite. Just as the field of holding of an Israelite [which a priest had

redeemed] goes out of his hands [on the Jubilee year] and is apportioned among his fellow priests, so his devoted field [as in the above instance] goes out of his hands and is apportioned among his fellow priests (*Ibid.* 34a). 127-129

to the priest shall be - This teaches us that general "devotions" [i.e., unqualified as to the recipient] go to the priests [and not to Temple maintenance] (*Ibid.* 28b).¹³⁰

to the priest shall be - R. Chiyya b. Avin said: If one devoted his fields, he gives them to a priest of that watch [i.e., of the watch officiating at the time], it being written: "as a devoted field; to the priest shall be his holding"; and we derive: "priest" [here]-"priest," in respect to the theft of a convert [where it is obvious that the "priest" in question is one of that watch] (*Ibid.*).¹³¹

to the priest shall be his holding - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if a priest redeemed a field destined to go out to the priests on the Jubilee year, he should not say: Since it is destined to go out to the priests, and it is already in my hands, let it remain with me! What is more, it follows a fortiori, viz.: If I gain what belongs to others [i.e., consecrated fields of holding unredeemed by the owners], should I not retain my own! [To obviate this] it is written: "his holding" [i.e., "to the priest shall be] his [own] holding" [i.e., his own patrimony], and this is not his. What is done with it? It goes out of his hands [on the Jubilee year] and is apportioned among his fellow priests (Ibid. 25b). 132, 133

27:22 And if the field of his acquisition, which is not of the field of his holding, he shall consecrate to the L-rd,

which is not of the field of his holding - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if one bought a field from his father and consecrated it, after which his father died — whence is it derived that it has the status of a field of holding? From: "And if the field of his acquisition, which is not of the field of his holding, he shall consecrate to the L-rd" — A field which cannot eventually be a field of holding goes out — to exclude one which can eventually be a field of holding (*Ibid.* 26b). 134

27:23 Then the priest shall reckon for him the worth of your valuation until the Jubilee year, and he shall give your valuation on that day; it is holy to the L-rd.

the worth of your valuation - The Rabbis taught: What is the intent of "the worth"? Because it is written (16): "the sowing of a *chomer* of barley for fifty silver shekels" [in respect to a field of holding], I might think that the same applied to a field of acquisition; it is, therefore, written: "the worth" (*Ibid.* 14b). 135

the worth of your valuation - It [i.e., the valuation of a field of acquisition] is being likened to [human] valuations. Just as in human valuations [i.e., the redemption of a human being], a fifth is not added, so in [the redemption of] a field of acquisition, a fifth is not added (*Ibid.*).¹³⁶

and he shall give your valuation - R. Hamnuna said: All agree in respect to valuations that though one did not say: "That is upon me" [to give], he is responsible for restitution [if it goes lost], it being written: "and he shall give your valuation" — They are non-sacred in your hand [and, therefore, you are responsible for them] until they come to the hands of the Temple treasurer (Chullin 139b). 137

on that day. The Rabbis taught: "and he shall give your valuation on that day". He should not wait for better prices on jewelry, [consecrations to the Temple being governed by the "here and now"] (Erchin 24a). 138

it is holy to the L-rd - This teaches us that unqualified consecrations go towards Temple maintenance (*Ibid.*). 139

27:24 In the Jubilee year the field shall return to the one from whom it was bought, who has the holding in the land.

In the Jubilee year - It was taught: "In the Jubilee year the field shall return to the one from whom it was bought." I might think that it returned to the Temple treasurer, from whom it was bought; it is, therefore, written: "who has the holding in the land" [i.e., the original owner]. In that case, why is it written: "to the one from whom it was

bought"? For I might think that a field which went out [on the Jubilee year] to the priests, and was sold by the priest [who acquired it], and was consecrated by the buyer and redeemed by another — I might think that such a field reverted to the original owner [whose field of holding it was before he consecrated it]; it is, therefore, written: "to the one from whom it was bought" [namely, the priest; for the field was not bought from the original owner, but gained by the Temple through consecration] (Ibid. 26a). 140, 141

27:25 And all of your valuations shall be according to the shekel of the sanctuary; twenty *gerah* shall the shekel be.

And all of your valuations shall be according to [lit., "with"] the shekel - There is no valuation of less than a sela [the same as a shekel], it being written: "And all of your valuations shall be with the shekel" — And all of your valuations shall not be for less than a shekel (*Ibid.* 7b). 142

with the shekel of the sanctuary - to exclude [redemption by] land, servants, and bonds (*Torath Cohanim*).¹⁴³

twenty gerah shall the shekel be - This teaches us that the shekel is twenty gerah. Whence is it derived that if he wishes to increase the value he may do so? From: "it shall be" [connoting the possibility of a change]. But I might think [in that event] that he may decrease it! [This possibility is countermanded by] (Numbers 18:6): "It is twenty gerah" [i.e., at least twenty gerah] (Bechoroth 50a). 144

27:26 But a first-born, which is a firstling to the L-rd among the beasts, a man shall not consecrate it. Whether ox or lamb, it is the L-rd's.

which is a firstling to the L-rd - When it is a firstling to the L-rd [i.e., when it is born], you may not consecrate it [as a burnt-offering], but you may consecrate it when it is still in the womb. I might think that the same applies to the fetuses of all consecrated animals [i.e., that he may consecrate the fetus of a consecrated animal as a different type of

offering (from its mother)]; it is, therefore, written: "But," to make this distinction (Temurah 25a). 145,146

among the beasts, a man shall not consecrate it - The Rabbis taught: If it were just written: "A first-born...shall not consecrate," I might understand it as: A [human] first-born shall not make consecrations; it is, therefore, written: "a man shall not consecrate it" i.e., You do not consecrate it, but a human first-born may make consecrations. But I still might understand it as: A [human] first-born shall not consecrate it, but others shall; it is, therefore, written: "among the beasts" — i.e., it is a [first-born] beast that is being referred to [and not a first-born human being] (Ibid.). 147

shall not consecrate - It was taught: It [i.e., a first-born] is not to be consecrated towards any type of sacrifice, it being written: "But a first-born, which is a firstling to the L-rd...a man shall not consecrate it" (Bechoroth 15b). 148

shall not consecrate - It was taught: One verse reads (*Deuteronomy* 15:19): "All the first-born...you shall consecrate," and another: "a man shall not consecrate"! [How is this to be resolved?] The latter is a negative commandment [not to consecrate a first-born towards any type of sacrifice.] "You shall consecrate" refers to what was taught, viz.: Whence is it derived that if a firstling were born in one's flock it is a mitzvah to declare him consecrated [as a first-born]? From: "the male you shall consecrate" (Erchin 29a). 149, 150

shall not consecrate - It was taught: If one [mistakenly] took his shekel from consecrated money [donated for Temple maintenance] — if the contribution were made [as in this case it was, for Temple maintenance] and the animal [which he bought for this money] were sacrificed, then he is considered to have abused sacred property, it being written: "But a first-born, which is a firstling to the L-rd among the beasts, a man shall not consecrate it" — If something is already consecrated, it is not susceptible of a new consecration [so that in the above case simply designating the animal as a sacrifice would be meaningless, a consecration of "Temple maintenance" already inhering in the monies; but the act of sacrificing the animal does alter the original consecration and thus constitutes an abuse of sacred property (me'ilah)] (Yerushalmi Shekalim 2:2). [151,152]

Whether ox or lamb - This tells me only of a first-born. Whence do we derive that with all consecrated animals there is no transfering from one type of consecration to another? From: 'Whether ox or lamb" [in any sacrificial status] (*Torath Cohanim*). 153, 154

it is the L-rd's - It [an animal originally designated as an offering] is sacrificed, but its substitute is not sacrificed [but is allowed to graze until it sustains a blemish disqualifying it as an offering] (Zevachim 81b). 155

27:27 And if among the unclean beasts, then he shall redeem it with your valuation, and he shall add its fifth upon it; and if it is not redeemed, then it shall be sold by your valuation.

And if among the unclean beasts - A Tanna taught in the presence of R. Elazar: "And if among the unclean beasts" [What is the intent of "unclean"?] Just as an unclean beast, which is characterized by a beginning of sanctity [(i.e., It begins by being consecrated to Temple maintenance [Its end, however, is not sanctity in that it cannot be offered as a sacrifice])] and exclusive dedication to Heaven [i.e., It is used entirely for Temple maintenance, the owner having no share in it]— just as an unclean beast requires an additional fifth [for its redemption], so all that are characterized by a beginning of sanctity and exclusive dedication to Heaven require an additional fifth [for their redemption] (Bava Metzia 54b). 156,157

And if among the unclean beasts - [What is the intent of "unclean"?] Just as an unclean beast is characterized by an equivalence of the time of redemption to the time of consecration [the animal being unclean at both of those times], so I include [as not requiring special valuation by the priest] a dead animal which is characterized by the same type of equivalence; and I exclude an animal which died after it was consecrated [there being no redemption for the animal in that event] (Yerushalmi Ma'aser Sheni 3:6). 158, 159

then he shall redeem it with your valuation - It was taught: Consecrated property returns to non-sacred status both through sale and through transference [of the sanctity onto the money], it being written: "then he shall redeem it with your valuation and he shall add its fifth upon it" — this is transference; "and if it is not redeemed, then it shall be sold by your valuation" — this is sale (Succah 40b). 160

then he shall redeem it with your valuation - This teaches us that the sanctity "attaches" to his money [see above] (Rashi on Avodah Zarah 54b). 161

and he shall add its fifth upon it - How is the fifth added? So that it and the fifth are five [equal parts (as opposed to a fifth of the principal)] (Bava Metzia 54b). 162

and if it is not redeemed - The mitzvah of redemption is with the owner; and he comes before all others, as it is written: "And if it is not redeemed [by the owner], then it shall be sold by your valuation" (Bechoroth 13a). 163

27:28 But every "devotion" which a man shall devote to the L-rd, of all that he has, of man and beast, and of field of his holding, shall not be sold and shall not be redeemed; every devotion, holy of holies is it to the L-rd.

which a man shall devote - It was taught: Whence is it derived that epithets of devotions [i.e., non-standard forms of standard terms of devotion] are considered as devotions? From: "But every devotion." Now why state [in addition]: "which a man shall devote"? To teach that epithets of devotions are considered as devotions (Yerushalmi Nedarim 1:1).164

of all that he has, etc. - The Rabbis taught: [One should devote] "of all that he has," and not all that he has; "of man," and not every man; "of beast," and not all beasts; "of field of holding," and not every field of holding (Erchin 28a). 165,166

of man - "of man" — these are his Canaanite man-servants and maidservants (Gittin 38b), 167

of man and beast - It was taught: I might think that a man could devote his son and his daughter, his Hebrew man-servant and maid-servant, and the field of his acquisition [as opposed to his field of holding]; it is, therefore, written: "beast." Just as he has a right to sell a beast for perpetuity, so [he may devote] all that he has a right to sell for perpetuity (*Erchin* 28b). 168

every devotion, etc. - The Rabbis taught: Devoted objects, so long as they are in the owner's house, are consecrated, to all intents and purposes, it being written: "every devotion, holy of holies is it to the L-rd." Once they have been given to the priest, they are non-sacred, to all intents and purposes [i.e., he may do whatever he wishes with them], it being written (*Numbers* 18:14): "Every devoted thing of the Jews, to you [the priest] shall it be" (*Ibid.* 29a). 169

holy of holies is it to the L-rd - "it"—to exclude a first-born. And why mention this? For it was taught: In respect to the first-born it is written (Numbers 18:17): "It shall not be redeemed," but it may be sold (if it sustained a blemish); and in respect to ma'aser it is written (33): "It may not be redeemed," nor may it be sold. For this reason [to point up the difference between devoted objects, which may not be sold, and the first-born, which may], it is written: "it" (Temurah 5b). 170,171

is it to the L-rd - What is the intent of: "to the L-rd"? To teach that higher-order and lower-order offerings are susceptible of "devotion" [If he devotes them, he gives their monetary value to the priest] (Erchin 28b). 172

27:29 Every devotion which is devoted of man shall not be redeemed; it is to die.

Every devotion, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that if one awaiting execution said: "My valuation upon me" [to give to the Temple], he has said nothing? From: "Every devotion" [in this instance, "devoted unto death"] shall not be redeemed" [i.e., he has no monetary value]. I might think [that this applies] even before the verdict were pronounced; it is, therefore, written: "of man," and not "all of the man" [The connotation is one of limitation] (*Ibid.* 6b). 173,174

Every devotion, etc. - It was taught: R. Yishmael says: Because we find that those punishable by death at the hands of Heaven may give money and gain atonement, we might think that the same could be done by

those condemned to death by the court; it is, therefore, written: "Every devotion [unto death] which is devoted of man [i.e., the court] shall not be redeemed [by money]." And this tells me only of severe capital offenses, whose unwitting perpetration is not subject to atonement. Whence do I derive the same for lesser capital offenses, whose unwitting perpetration is subject to atonement? From: "Every devotion" (Ibid.). 175-177

Every devotion, etc. - It was taught: Whence is it derived that "devotions" go to the priests of the watch [those officiating at that time, and not just to any priest]? From (28): "Every devotion... holy of holies is it to the L-rd" [and only the priests of the watch have access to the "holy of holies" (i.e., the sacrifices)] (Yerushalmi Challah 4:4).¹⁷⁸

27:30 And all the *ma'aser* [tithes] of the earth, of the seed of the earth, of the fruit of the tree, it is the L-rd's; it is holy to the L-rd.

And all the ma'aser of the land - It was taught: I might think that Scripture is referring to two ma'asroth [ma'aser rishon and ma'aser sheni]; it is, therefore written: "it is the L-rd's" [i.e., ma'aser sheni is the L-rd's" [i.e., ma'aser sheni is the L-rd's" [i.e., ma'aser sheni is the L-rd's in that it must be eaten in Jerusalem]. "it" is written here, and "it" is written elsewhere [in connection with ma'aser sheni (Deuteronomy, Re'eh)]. Whatever is lacking here, [in respect to the laws of ma'aser sheni] is mentioned there (Torath Cohanim). 179

And all the ma'aser of the land - It was taught: Whence is it derived that one does not give *terumah* from the fruits of Eretz Yisrael for fruits outside of it, and from fruits outside of it for fruits of Eretz Yisrael? From: "And all the ma'aser of *the land*" (Sifrei, Korach 18:26).180

of the seed of the earth - to include the seed of garlic, onycha, and berries, and to exclude upper *lof*, the seed of leeks, the seed of onions, the seed of turnips and radishes, and other garden seeds which are not eaten (Yerushalmi Ma'asroth 1:1).¹⁸¹

of the fruit of the tree - to include all fruits of the tree, and to exclude the carobs of Shitah and Tzalmonah and those of Gederah [which are of inferior quality] (*Ibid.*).¹⁸²

of the fruit of the tree - A principle was stated with respect to ma'aser: All plants that can be eaten at the beginning [of their growth] and at the end, though they are preserved [in soil] to add food [i.e., to grow larger] — all such plants are subject to ma'aser, whether they be large or small. And all plants which cannot be eaten at the beginning, but only at the end, are not subject to ma'aser until they become edible, it being written: "of the seed of the earth, of the fruit of the tree" — until it matures and produces [edible] fruit (Rav Ovadiah Bartenura on Ma'asroth 1:1).183

it is the L-rd's - One who betroths a woman with his share of ma'aser sheni, whether unwittingly [i.e., not knowing it was ma'aser sheni] or wittingly, is not betrothed, it being written: "And all of the ma'aser of the land, of the seed of the earth, of the fruit of the tree, it is the L-rd's; it is holy to the L-rd" — and is not to be used for betrothing a woman (Kiddushin 53a). 184

27:31 And if redeem, will redeem a man of his ma'aser, its fifth shall he add upon it.

And if redeem, will redeem - to include his heir [as adding the fifth] (Zevachim 6a). 185

And if redeem, will redeem a man - A woman redeems ma'aser sheni without adding the fifth. Why so? For Scripture states: "a man," and not a woman (Kiddushin 24a). 186

of his ma'aser - Though, in general, ma'aser sheini is "Heavenly property," still, for purposes of redemption, Scripture placed it in his possession, it being written: "And if redeem, will redeem a man of his ma'aser, its fifth shall he add upon it." Scripture calls it "his ma'aser," and he adds a fifth [which he would not do if it were not regarded as his] (Bava Kamma 69b).187

of his ma'aser. The Rabbis taught: "And if redeem, will redeem a man of his ma'aser," and not all of his ma'aser—to exclude [redemption of] ma'aser sheini which does not have in it [either in the ma'aser or in the fifth] the value of a prutah (Bava Metzia 53b). 188

of his ma'aser - [He may redeem] "of his ma'aser," and not all of his

ma'aser — to exclude ma'aser which was brought into Jerusalem and then taken out. [Once it was in Jerusalem, the mitzvah of eating in Jerusalem devolves upon it, and it can no longer be redeemed] (Torath Cohanim). 189

of his ma'aser, its fifth - R. Yochanan said: All ma'aser whose substance or redemption are not his [but another man's] is not subject to the additional fifth, it being written: "And if redeem, will redeem a man of his ma'aser, its fifth shall he add upon it" — when it and its redemption are his (Yerushalmi Ma'asroth 4:3). 190

its fifth shall he add - How is the fifth added? So that it and its fifth are five [equal parts (as opposed to a fifth of the principal)] (Bava Metzia 54b). 191

shall he add upon it - to include its fifth as being similar to it [with respect to the halachah of exchange of ma'aser sheini for money] (*Ibid.*). 192

27:32 All the *ma'aser* of cattle and sheep, all that shall pass under the staff, the tenth shall be holy to the L-rd.

And all ma'aser of cattle and sheep - The ma'aser of beasts applies to cattle and to sheep, and ma'aser is not given from one for the other, it being written: "the tenth" — give a tenth for one and a tenth for the other. If so, the same should be true for lambs and goats [i.e., that one is not tithed for the other]? [This is not so, for] Scripture writes: "and sheep" [stressing singularity in the Hebrew], implying that all sheep [i.e., all sheep-like animals] are one (Bechoroth 54b). 193

all that shall pass - The Rabbis taught: How are they tithed? He herds them into the corral, the mothers on the outside and they [the young animals to be tithed] on the inside, [and he tithes them when] they start whining and going out to their mothers. Why does he himself not take them out? For it is written: "shall pass," and not "that shall be made to pass" (Ibid. 58b). 194

all that shall pass - Rava said: An appropriate number [of animals at the outset] exempts [those which have already passed, from the obligation of tithing (i.e., If he began with ten animals and after five had passed, one of the uncounted ones died, so that he cannot complete the count, those which have already passed are exempt from the obligation of tithing)] it being written: "all that shall pass," and not those which have already passed (*Ibid.* 59b). 195

all that shall pass - All consecrated animals may be redeemed, and their substitutes may be redeemed, except for the first-born and ma'aser. Ma'aser is derived: "passing" [here] - "passing," in respect to the first-born [i.e., Just as the first-born cannot be redeemed, so, ma'aser] (Temurah 5b). 196,197

all that shall pass - The young of an animal that is ma'aser may not nurse from it. Whence is this derived? [It is derived] "passing" [here] - "passing," in respect to the first-born. Just as the first-born is subject to me'ilah [the halachah forbidding the derivation of benefit from sacred property], so, the milk of animals that are ma'aser is subject to me'ilah (Me'ilah 13a). 198, 199

that shall pass under the staff - The Rabbis taught: "all that shall pass under the staff" — to exclude a *treifah* [an animal with an organic defect], which does not pass (*Bechoroth* 58b).²⁰⁰

under the staff - It is a *mitzvah* to count them with the staff. If he did not count them with the staff, or if he counted them while they were lying down or standing, whence is it derived [that the tithing is valid?] From: "the tenth shall be holy" — in any event (*Ibid.*).^{201,202}

the tenth - It was taught: I might think that if he had one hundred and took ten [at random] or ten and took one, he has fulfilled the obligation of tithing; it is, therefore, written: "the tenth," and this is not "the tenth" (Ibid.).²⁰³

the tenth - Scripture requires "the," definite tenth, and not a possible tenth [i.e., If a counted animal became mixed up with those that were not yet counted, no tithe is to be taken, for the tenth may be the already counted one] (Ibid.).²⁰⁴

the tenth shall be holy - It was taught: If one slaughters a Paschal lamb as ma'aser during the other days of the year, it is not consecrated. Why so? For Scripture states: "the tenth shall be holy" — This one [that

passes under the staff] is ma'aser, and another [that he simply designates as such] is not ma'aser (Zevachim 9a).²⁰⁵

the tenth shall be holy. The tithing of animals obtains with non-sacred animals and not with consecrated ones. Whence is this derived? From: "shall be holy," and not which are already holy (Bechoroth 53b).²⁰⁶

the tenth shall be holy. This tells me only of one that is declared the tenth. Whence is it derived [that the tithing is valid] even if there were no explicit declaration? From: "shall be holy" — in any event (*Ibid.* 58b).²⁰⁷

the tenth shall be holy - The Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that if he [erroneously] called the ninth the tenth; the tenth, the ninth; and the eleventh, the tenth, that they are all consecrated [as ma'aser]? From: "And all ma'aser of cattle ... all that shall pass ... the tenth shall be holy" [implying that both passing as tenth and being declared tenth make an animal ma'aser] (Ibid. 60b).²⁰⁸

27:33 He shall not discriminate between good and bad, and he shall not substitute for it; and if he did substitute for it, then it and its substitute shall be holy. It shall not be redeemed.

He shall not discriminate - It was taught: All are believed in respect to blemishes of ma'aser [i.e., to say that the tenth was blemished and, therefore, not subject to all of the halachoth of an unblemished tenth]. Why so? For if he [the owner] wished, he could have blemished it to begin with. But would he know when it would pass [i.e., whether it would be the tenth]? And if you say that he could have placed it at the head of the ten [so that it would pass as the tenth], does Scripture not state: "He shall not discriminate between good and bad"! [He is believed, rather, because] if he wished he could have blemished the entire flock (Ibid. 36b).²⁰⁹

He shall not discriminate, etc. - It was taught: Blemishes do not invalidate ma'aser [i.e., If the tenth were blemished, it is still regarded as ma'aser], it being written: "He shall not discriminate between good and bad [i.e., blemished], and he shall not substitute for it" (*Ibid.* 57a).²¹⁰

He shall not discriminate, etc. - R. Bun b. Chiyya asked in the presence of R. Zira; If he "transgressed" and did discriminate [by assuring that the tenth would not be blemished], is he actually considered to have transgressed? He answered: Wherever Scripture comes to permit something, one does not transgress [if he waives the permit]. What does Scripture come to permit in this instance? To consecrate blemished animals [as ma'aser] (Yerushalmi Rosh Hashanah 1:1).²¹¹

and he shall not substitute for it - It was taught: R. Shimon said: *Ma'aser* was in the category of all consecrated animals in respect to substitution. Why, then, was it singled out for special mention? To teach: Just as *ma'aser* is an individual offering [as opposed to a communal one], and obligatory, and not brought in partnership, so, all offerings possessing these characteristics may not be substituted for (*Temurah* 13a).^{212,213}

It shall not be redeemed - [This is stated] in juxtaposition with: "then it and its substitute." Redemption is, thereby, being likened to substitution. Just as [the prohibition against] substitution obtains only when the animal is alive, so [that against] redemption obtains only when the animal is alive; and it is the Rabbis who decreed [redemption forbidden] after slaughtering lest it come to be practised before slaughtering (Bechoroth 31b).²¹⁴

It shall not be redeemed - It is written here: "It shall not be redeemed, and, in respect to "devotions" (28): "It shall not be sold and not be redeemed." Just as "It shall not be redeemed" there carries selling along with it [in the prohibition], so, "It shall not be redeemed" here (*Ibid.* 32a).²¹⁵

27:34 These are the *mitzvoth* which the L-rd commanded Moses to the children of Israel on Mount Sinai.

These are the mitzvoth - From here ["These"] it is derived that a prophet is not permitted to originate anything from this point on (Shabbath 104a).²¹⁶

These are the mitzvoth - A general rule was stated with respect to levirate marriages, viz.: In all instances of issur mitzvah ["prohibitions

of mitzvah"], such as: a widow falling for levirate marriage to a highpriest, or a divorcée or a chalutzah [one who had participated in the chalitzah ceremony as a release from levirate marriage] falling to a regular priest, chalitzah is performed and levirate marriage does not take place. Why are these called "issur mitzvah"? Because it is written: "These [including the ban of marriage between a widow and a highpriest, and a divorcée or a chalutzah with a regular priest] are the mitzvoth" (Yevamoth 20a).²¹⁷

These are the mitzvoth - R. Illa said: This [i.e., "These"] teaches us that if one performed them as commanded, they are mitzvoth; and if not, they are not mitzvoth (Yerushalmi Shabbath 13:3).²¹⁸

which the L-rd commanded, etc. - "which the L-rd commanded Moses" — Worthy is the messenger of his Sender; "Moses to the children of Israel" — Worthy is the messenger of those to whom he was sent, and worthy are those to whom he was sent of their messenger; "to the children of Israel" — It is the merit of Israel that caused [them to receive the Torah] (Torath Cohanim).²¹⁹

on Mount Sinai - This teaches us that all of them [the mitzvoth] were stated on Sinai (Ibid.), 220